

THEOLOGY

A Monthly Journal of Historic Christianity

Edited by the Rev. E. G. SELWYN, B.D., REDHILL RECTORY, HAVANT,
to whom all editorial matters should be addressed.

Vol. XIV

JANUARY, 1927

No. 79

EDITORIAL

THE ENGLISH SUNDAY

THIS subject was recently brought to the fore by a disappointing discussion at the November session of the Church Assembly. The discussion was disappointing because it was focussed upon a particular issue which lay on the circumference rather than at the heart of the problem. The Assembly was certainly in no mind to pass a vote of censure upon the Estates Committee of the Ecclesiastical Commission for having thrown open some of their land, under careful safeguards, for games and recreation on Sunday afternoon. Yet the debate produced singularly little of constructive suggestion or thought. Many who were in general agreement with the Dean of Exeter's statement of principles yet felt that they did not make up for the threatened loss of something distinctively precious in the English Sunday. Even the Bishop of Durham, whose speech was marked by his usual earnestness and wit, and who certainly raised the discussion to higher levels, failed to suggest how the influence of modern facilities of locomotion upon the observance of Sunday was to be effectively countered. The result of the debate was to create the impression, upon many at any rate who heard it or read of it, that in the matter of Sunday the Church was fighting a losing battle.

The tennis-racket and the motor-bicycle play an undoubtedly important part among the factors which account for a pronounced change of public habits in regard to Sunday. To these should be added a third—the Sunday newspapers. Some of these are of a high order; a paper such as the *Sunday Times*, for instance, not only contains excellent and well-written criticisms of art, literature, and music, but gives to these a much larger proportion of space than any week-day journal. But unfortunately there is also another side to the picture; and for the yellow press Sunday is no more than an occasion for

becoming yellower; so that there is no vile deed of adultery, murder, or deceit which is not purveyed to the doors of the masses that day, dressed up in all the finery that sensationalism can suggest. This kind of evil can only be overcome by the provision of something better at the same cost. The provision of a Sunday Broad-Sheet on expert and healthy lines would surely not be beyond the resources of British journalism; and the influence of the Church and its gatherings of worshippers on that day should secure for it an initial circulation which would greatly reduce the risk of the venture.

We have mentioned those factors of modern life which have tended to endanger the distinctive character of the English Sunday. At the same time there are others of no less importance to set against them, if a fair balance is to be struck. Chief among these is the influence of Broadcasting, which received no mention in the Assembly debate. Yet the religious use of Broadcasting is surely one of the most astonishing and most hopeful phenomena in the spiritual life of our time. The blessings which the wireless services have brought to the old, the blind, and invalids is too well known to need emphasis: deafness is almost the only physical infirmity left outside the range of its alleviating power. But the young and fit enjoy it no less than the aged and infirm, and it is safe to say that many of those who scour the roads or play games on Sunday morning or afternoon count on hearing the radio service when they get home in the evening.

Moreover, the tendency of this spiritual influence is on the whole, we believe, towards a far wider and deeper appreciation of the distinctive genius of the Church of England. What people value is not simply the sermon, but the whole dignity and reverence of the evening office, with its Psalms and Lessons, Responses and Collects—once so familiar, now becoming familiar again. There has perhaps never been a time when the *ethos* of the Prayer Book has penetrated so widely into English homes as to-day. We have to remember that it is not virgin soil. Small as may be the proportion of our population which goes to church on Sundays, the proportion of it which through school or Sunday School has learnt the rudiments of our worship is very large; and it is that sleeping ember which is being fanned into flame. And with this there comes a growing sense of membership in a spiritual body. The lonely person, or the person in a rut, finds himself part of a vast unseen congregation worshipping in the same way as he. He feels the Church around him, the mother of his many brethren; his individualism or

sectarianism is transcended; he knows himself part of a larger whole, and he identifies it without difficulty with the historic Church of his land.

No statistics are, or probably can be, available as to the number of listeners to any particular service; but the evident popularity of broadcasted services would assuredly justify us in saying that they have done much to restore one important aspect of Sunday observance—that which belongs to the home. What was sound and true and healthy in the old sabbatarianism was just this—that on one day in the week the home as a home had special customs, and customs different from those of week-days. Dress, meals, occupations, manner of life, were all distinct. Often, no doubt, the negative and restrictive side of these customs was overdone, so that to many young people Sunday became a dull and irksome day. But things should not be judged by their excess. In thousands of other homes the ideals of Sunday were healthy and bracing: the quiet occupations (reading, letter-writing, collect-learning, etc.) in contrast with the riotous games of week-days, the visit to old or invalid friends, the choice of books, the afternoon walk—all these gave to the first day of the week a tranquillity and consecration which added dignity to the whole of life. It would be quite untrue, happily, to say that all this has gone; even the increased means of locomotion are made in many cases to minister to it through making the peace of the countryside accessible to the town-dweller: but undoubtedly it is greatly endangered. One of the benefits of Broadcasting is that it tends to reverse the process. For it enters the home, gathers a group of its members together, and makes them, at least for a space of time, hearers and not hurriers, a family met in the presence of God. Bishop Pelham of Norwich (consecrated in 1857) used to tell how he remembered hearing the hum of family prayer in the cottages in the village street at night, when he passed them as a boy. Nowhere in England could that be heard to-day. But in thousands of cottage homes, none the less, a real family prayer does take place to-day, as they listen-in to the message of the wireless.

The relation of this revived home worship to that public worship of God which is for all Catholic Christians the chief obligation of Sunday has close affinities with the relation which Hooker discerns between the invisible and the visible Church. Of the former he says that it cannot

. . . be sensibly discerned by any man, inasmuch as the parts thereof are some in heaven already with Christ, and the rest that are on earth

(albeit their natural persons be visible) we do not discern under this property, whereby they are truly and infallibly of that body. Only our minds by intellectual conceit are able to apprehend, that such a real body there is, a body collective, because it containeth an huge multitude; a body mystical, because the mystery of their conjunction is removed altogether from sense. Whatsoever we read in Scripture concerning the endless love, and the saving mercy which God sheweth toward His Church, the only proper subject thereof is this Church.

But in the following section Hooker goes on to point out now, when it is a question of being not hearers only, but doers, of the Word, we must pass on to a more definite and embodied conception:

And as those everlasting promises of love, mercy, and blessedness belong to the mystical Church; even so on the other side when we read of any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, the Church whom this doth concern is a sensibly known company.*

In the case of the invisible Church which Broadcasting has brought to self-consciousness, that is indeed abundantly true. For the wireless is not a creator, but a transmitter; and it transmits what the visible Church in its worship supplies; without this last there could be no "huge multitude" of listening worshippers. Moreover, those worshippers are in the most literal sense "hearers, and not doers," passive rather than active; if it comes to any duty which the Church of God is bound unto, it is necessary for them to take their station in the visible body and so do their part.

For there is something distinctive and inalienable about the visible congregation, if only we can get at it; and the contrast with the worship of those who listen-in throws it into sharper relief. Two things especially seem to be required of the services in church, if they are to hold their own in England to-day. The first is that the main services of Sunday must be *real gatherings*. It is easy to over-value numbers; but it is equally easy to under-value them. Even if the people are not many, they must look many. One of the great objections to the ordinary Mattins and Evensong arrangement is that it divides the available worshippers, and divides them on a false basis—that of social rank. The result is two small congregations, where there might be at least one large one; and those two small congregations are constituted on the recognition of precisely such distinctions as have no place—so the Apostle said—in the Church of Christ. If we are to regain the habit of public worship, we have got to pay heed to psychology; and

* L.E.P., III. i, 1, 2.

one of the most certain facts attested by psychology is the power of organized numbers. The present semi-feudal division of morning and evening church-goers is both wrong in principle and ineffective in practice. In whatever rearrangement of services we contemplate—and the Report of the Archbishop's Committee on "The Worship of the Church" bade us to prepare ourselves for "drastic change"—the importance of massed effect needs to be kept in the foreground of consideration.

The second requirement of public worship, if it is to maintain its distinctive claim and obligation, is that it should be an occasion when something is not only said or sung, but *done*. You cannot broadcast a sacrament; for its essence consists in things and acts, to which the words are joined. Part of the Church's reaction, therefore, to the present situation in the matter of Sunday observance, will be to bear a more unequivocal witness to its sacramental worship. And first in regard to Baptism. Almost all that could justly be said fifty years ago as to the treatment of the Eucharist as an "extra service" for the few could be said with equal justice of the treatment of Baptism to-day. Despite the perfectly clear purpose expressed in the rubric to the office for Public Baptism, that this sacrament should be administered "when the most number of people come together," it is still customary in the majority of churches to make it a relatively private service. We need here to recover the more true and solemn usage of earlier days;—to give public notice of the sacrament in church on the Sunday previous; to combine it with Mattins rather than with Evensong; and to celebrate it with such reverent and speaking ceremonial, by use of lights and vestments, as that advocated in the Green Book and adopted by the Houses of Clergy and Laity. No service, let us add—not even the Eucharist itself—gives better opportunity for teaching the central truths of the Faith, and bringing them home to the heart, than the administration of Holy Baptism.

This leads us to the question of the main service of Sunday morning. We publish this month a group of articles which represents what we believe to be the right line of development. Advocated originally by the present Bishop of Truro in his book *Some Principles of Liturgical Reform* (1908), it has taken long to digest, but that is the common fate of ideas which are soundly based; and the present writer can testify from his own experience to its practical value.* Mattins as a daily office is

* Perhaps I may take this opportunity of correcting a mistaken impression which I am told has been formed as to the meaning of a sentence in my book, *The*

exquisite: but, when it stands by itself as the staple service of Sunday morning, it is so partial in its expression of Christian faith that it misleads the mind and cramps the spirit of devotion. On the other hand, it is admirable and satisfying as a preparation for either Baptism or the Communion. Psalmody and Lections then take their proper place as leading up to a divine action which is rooted in the Cross and proclaims the mystery of grace.

The principle that Mattins should always be completed by one or other of the two "sacraments of the Gospel" obviously admits of divers kinds of application. But any one of them will involve change in established habits; and it is usually this change that presents the difficulty. Yet we believe that the chief requisites can be fairly simply stated. The first is that the priest should be quite certain in his own mind what he wants to do. Half the divisions of opinion that arise in parishes over changes in services are due to a divided mind in the priest himself. Secondly, he must not hurry. Haste, indeed, is the child of doubt; and the more sure he is of the truth of his principles, the more he can afford to wait until he and his people know one another. Not that his teaching of itself will usually stir a Church Council to initiate change. It is enough if they know enough of his good faith not to oppose it. And, when that time comes, he may reckon that the way is open.

We have purposely assumed that the case is not one of creating a morning congregation where there is none, nor of creating a second morning congregation where one already exists, but of converting an existing Mattins congregation into something better. Some loss there may be, or at least some grumbling and some going out during the offertory; though much of this can be met by individual explanation and appeal. But this will probably be more than compensated for by two more marked results. One will be a quickened interest and enquiry in circles which have been, for years and years perhaps, outside the Church's active life in the village. We probably have not realized the extent to which Mattins is associated in the minds of many people with a position of privilege and social (or other) superiority, so that its congregation has come to be looked upon as a kind of close corporation, the representa-

Approach to Christianity, pp. 261, 262. The sentence is, "It should be plainly recognized that a church which includes Mattins as well as the Eucharist in its habitual worship is devotionally richer than a church which is accustomed to the latter only." This has been interpreted as a plea for Mattins rather than the Eucharist as the chief service of Sunday morning. But that is not what I either said or meant. What I meant is exactly expressed in the sentence in question.—E. G. S.

tive of a fixed system in which those outside it have no part. To dislodge Mattins from its exclusive prerogative on Sunday mornings and to develop it into something at once more human and more solemn is to dissipate this notion of a fixed system, to give proof of life pulsing behind the conventions of the Church, and to appeal, by deed rather than word, to those who have hitherto thought themselves disinherited.

And a second result should be greatly to strengthen Even-song. We have heard widespread complaints of the shrinkage of Evensong congregations of late years; but so far little has been done to deal with the difficulty. Some advocate dispensing with the liturgical form in favour of a more "popular" service; others the addition of "Devotions" at the end. But neither, we believe, hits the mark. What has been at fault has not been our form of service—its form is simple and greatly loved—but our organization behind it. What we have done is to divide into two congregations those who by natural disposition—that is, by their enjoyment of a choir office—are at one. Every consideration of strategy surely demands that this division of forces should cease. We have got sufficient worshippers for two strong congregations, so long as we give them two different types of service to use. Not only has each type its own votaries who like it best; but there will be more people who go to church twice on a Sunday if the services are of distinct kinds: while, finally, the clearer witness to the sacramental side of Christian faith and worship given by the sung Mass will ensure that the early celebration is more frequented than before.

THE PROBLEM OF THE SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE

IT will probably be generally admitted that the Sunday Morning Service is a problem in the Church of England, both as regards time and character, but especially the latter.

Even many of those who would deny the existence of any question as to the nature of the service, being quite clear in their own minds that the Lord's Service (or, on the other hand, Sung Mattins) is the obvious Church of England Service for Sunday morning, will not readily deny that there remains the problem of how to get their people to attend such a service in anything like satisfactory numbers.

The *existence* of the problem is indicated by the consideration given to it in the Report of the Archbishops' Committee on "The Worship of the Church"; in such books as the Bishop of Gloucester's *The Church of England*, and the Rev. E. G. Selwyn's *The Approach to Christianity*, as well as in the frequent recurrence to it in the columns of Church newspapers.

The *insistence* of the problem is felt by many a parish priest who is trying to make the most suitable provision in matters of worship for his parishioners, and especially does the pressure lie heavily on the country priest, for, as Mr. Selwyn remarks in the above-mentioned book: "The real difficulty is not in the towns, but in the villages and country towns where the Parish Church has to make a home for wide diversities of temperament."

This article is the result of the reflections of a country priest (who up to about twelve months ago had had only town experience) who is trying to solve the problem for his own parish, and who in the attempt has been led to read all that he could lay hands upon which has been written on the subject.

Put briefly, it is a plea for the more extended trial of the plan, suggested in the National Assembly's Report on Prayer Book Revision, of conflating Mattins (in an abbreviated form) and the Holy Eucharist—"trial," because, as the Bishop of Gloucester says, "It is quite clear that in many ways we are in a transition period," and, it may be added, we are likely to be so for some few years to come.

I. *What, then, is our aim in seeking a solution of this problem?*

Surely it is to find that form of service which is in accord with the whole teaching and character of the Church of England as a part of the Catholic Church, and which will meet the needs of the diverse temperaments and ages of our flocks, being

PROBLEM OF THE SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE 9

sufficiently varied in structure as to exercise the different capacities—devotional, intellectual, ethical—of each individual worshipper. In other words, it must be Catholic, akin to the worship of the great branches of the Church in East and West; it must be in accordance with the genius of the Church of England as expressed in the Prayer Book, and it must be suited to old and young, learned and simple.

Then, too, the Morning Service should be the Principal Service of Sunday, selected with the instructed regular Church-member mainly in mind, leaving the evening service to supply the more elementary needs of the uninstructed and less frequent attender.

Is it begging the question to suggest that such a service should centre round the celebration of the Holy Mysteries? Surely not.

The Archbishops' Report states (p. 15) that "the whole tradition of the Church is in favour of making this service in some way central." And even those who for various reasons feel that Morning Prayer is the most suitable service for the average English morning congregation, do not deny that even so the Holy Communion is the "principal service" of the Church of England. Anglo-Catholics and Evangelicals are agreed on this. Yet it is not easy to conceive how we can proclaim this fact to our people, and to the world, while the Holy Communion is celebrated at all hours but the recognized hour for the chief morning service, and is attended by only a small minority of Church-goers, and that not very frequently.

To most people the principal morning service in their parish church is the one at which the majority (including children) are present, and which is rendered with music and a due amount of ceremony—whether that ceremony is enacted in the sanctuary or in the nave.

A further argument, which should appeal to all parties, in favour of the restoration of the Eucharist to the position of the principal morning service has recently been made, in the writer's view, by Miss Evelyn Underhill in her excellent addresses to a group of clergy in the Liverpool Diocese, and published by Methuen and Co. under the title *Concerning the Inner Life*. Miss Underhill gives it as her certain conviction that "we gradually and imperceptibly learn more about God by this persistent attitude of humble adoration than we can hope to do by any amount of mental exploration." Again, she adds that such adoration "is the central service asked by God of human souls; and its neglect is responsible for much lack of spiritual depth and power." Miss Underhill is not speaking only, or mainly, of adoration at the Eucharist, but of the prayer of adoration in general, but those of us who value the

Eucharist as pre-eminently a service of adoration and "a sacrifice of praise and thanksgiving" will feel that Miss Underhill is underlining for us one of the main reasons why we should wish to bring our people also to value it.

II. In spite, however, of the many arguments which may be put forward in favour of restoring the Eucharist to its rightful place in the Anglican scheme of worship, those who are most anxious to see this come to pass need to bear in mind that in addition to the hindrances caused by prejudice, fear, and custom, which latter has engendered in the average Englishman a genuine attachment to Mattins as the "morning service," there are other reasons which to many minds point to Mattins as being intrinsically the more suitable service.

For instance, the Bishop of Gloucester in his charge *The Church of England* mentions the following in support of the traditional morning service:

1. Mattins provides greater variety than the Eucharist.
2. It conveys a larger element of instruction.
3. It is simpler and easier of comprehension.
4. The greater majority prefer Communion to be something separate and solemn.

Many people would probably not agree with these assertions, or at any rate would claim that they are outweighed by arguments in favour of the Eucharist, but it must be admitted that they are valid reasons for many, and in proportion as they are true they need careful consideration. The first two of the Bishop's reasons obviously gain what strength they have from the fact that our Morning Prayer is built upon the bed-rock of the Holy Scriptures, which accounts for the fact that Divine Service in the Church of England has retained a greater hold on the affections of the people, as it has done in no other part of the Catholic Church. Mr. Selwyn, in his book, would seem to agree in no small measure with the Bishop on this point when he says (p. 261): "It should be plainly recognized that a church which includes Mattins as well as Eucharist in its habitual worship is devotionally richer than a church which is accustomed to the latter only."

In view of such expressions of opinion, as well as on account of his own feeling of the lack of variety in the form of our Liturgy, the writer of this article has turned to the idea, rather against his traditional upbringing, of the principal service being such that, while its climax is the offering of the "Continual Remembrance of the Sacrifice of the Death of Christ," it shall also contain those variable Biblical elements which are found pre-eminently in Morning Prayer; in short, our present

PROBLEM OF THE SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE 11

Liturgy prefaced by an abbreviated Mattins commencing with "O Lord, open Thou our lips," and closing with the Benedictus, which might be used as an Introit unless a short hymn following it were preferred.

Fr. Underhill, in his *Catholic Faith in Practice*, notes that this suggestion is already being tried, and he criticizes such a service as being "an incongruous mixture of two distinct services, which will be disliked both by those who rightly wish to retain Morning Prayer as they know it, and by those who wish for a well-arranged Sung Mass."

Perhaps the comment of many will be that the proposal is a typical Anglican compromise which will satisfy neither party. Anglican compromises can indeed have the nature of back-boneless productions which lack the means of propulsion towards the desired end; yet we must not forget that in many cases they have led to wholesome reforms, and this suggested attempt at a solution of a difficult problem may prove to be not merely a compromise but a bringing out of our treasures a sensible synthesis which will enrich our worship and win more intelligent and devotional worshippers.

III. What are the objections which might be raised against such a plan?

Fr. Underhill mentions two obvious ones. It requires that Morning Prayer should be "so cut about as to be practically unrecognizable." The priest may at once feel that his liturgical sense is being outraged by such a proposal. Morning Prayer would give place to a mutilated Mattins. Yet it is but a return to the earlier form of Mattins as used in the undivided Church, and it is nearer the Sarum Mattins in structure than is our present service. The Sarum form had but one lesson, followed by the Te Deum (which might commend itself to those who fear that the conflation would make the entire service long and tedious). And what is the alternative? To keep Mattins as it is at present and *separate* it from the Eucharist, with the result that either the majority absent themselves from Mattins, thus losing the many benefits which the Divine Office affords, or else they attend Mattins and miss the Eucharist, which is surely a greater loss.

It might be urged, however, and not unreasonably, that Evensong provides practically all that Mattins can give, and that Evensong has the advantage of being already held high in popular estimation. Yet it is well for us to remember that many do not, and some cannot, attend church twice on Sunday, and that with the rapid, and perhaps welcome, decline of sabbatarianism, if we do not succeed in getting people to church on Sunday mornings we may fail to get them there at all.

The second objection noted by Fr. Underhill, that the proposal would make the service far too long, is more formidable, especially in churches where it is desired, and rightly so, to use elaborate music and ceremony. This would apply more to those churches where a High Mass is possible and desired. The matter would still be further complicated if the Litany were used in procession as the "Anglican Introit." Yet perhaps there would be real gain if the abbreviated Mattins were said as part of the one service, and so people were encouraged to attend. At any rate the shorter Sarum Mattins, concluding with the *Te Deum*, might be used.

The writer cannot help but feel that in our present Eucharist there is a lack of the varied uses of Holy Scripture. Many of the Epistles are most difficult to understand, and the Old Testament has no place except when the Decalogue is recited, and this tends to become monotonous, and however valuable the Commandments may be for purposes of self-examination they supply little scope for the exercise of the intellect. If the old Introits, Graduals, Tracts and Antiphons could be restored the difficulty would be in a large measure met, but even so it would seem that the use of our shortened Mattins would be preferable, being more simple and direct in character.

But this article has in view mainly the ordinary church in town and village (especially the latter), where one principal service, simple in character, is desired and even necessary. The Mattins portion of the service would occupy about twenty minutes; and if a simple setting were used for the Eucharist, the whole service, including the sermon, should not last more than an hour and twenty minutes.

Of course, the length of the service would be affected by the number of actual communicants, and it is not suggested that there should be no communicants. Indeed, it is highly desirable that there should be some to communicate with the priest so that the Eucharist should be a *real* communion, though not a *general* one. The majority of communicants, it is hoped, would be encouraged to receive the Blessed Sacrament at an earlier service, which should be recognized as an *additional* Eucharist and not the *principal* one, provided for those who wish to make their communions early and fasting. But in every parish there are some who, through age, infirmity, nature of employment, distance from the church (this is an important factor in the country), would find it necessary to communicate at the principal Eucharist. Thus the fear of the service becoming a general Communion and so lengthening the service unduly ought not to carry much weight.

PROBLEM OF THE SUNDAY MORNING SERVICE 13

IV. We may now briefly consider the advantages of adopting such a service composed of the Eucharist prefaced by an abbreviated Mattins.

1. It would meet the first three of the objections stated by the Bishop of Gloucester (and also the fourth, if the great majority could be persuaded to receive Communion at an early Mass—separate, solemn, and simple—and then to attend the later service without communicating). The enlarged form of service would give the desired measure of greater variety by the addition of Psalm, Canticle, and Lesson. The variety would also extend to the music, whether Anglican or Plain-song chants were used, and if the Mass were elaborately ordered, the simplicity of Mattins might provide a healthy variation in the ceremonial, and appeal to those who feel they are not attracted by orateness in worship.

2. It would provide a larger element of instruction, assuming of course, that the Revised Lectionary and Table of Psalms were used.

3. If, as the Archbishops' Report asserts, "the Communion service makes less demand for intellectual effort, and satisfies more directly the spiritual impulses than such services as Morning and Evening Prayer," and if Mattins makes a more intellectual appeal, then all our capacities would be called forth by one or other part of the composite service.

4. Another value of the service concerns our children and young people. While we may well be grateful that many children are learning by experience to love the Eucharist, and in their own way to enter into its import, would it not also be an advantage that they should become familiar with the Psalter, Canticles, and Lessons?

5. Such an arrangement would also meet the objection sometimes raised (some think unwarrantably) against the Sung Eucharist—viz., that if those who have received Communion at an early service wish to attend a sung service later in the morning, and to hear a sermon, they have to attend the same service over again. The suggested plan would insure that the principal service was not merely a repetition of the earlier communion.

6. Is it vain to hope that such a service might satisfy those who are at present wedded to Mattins? If the clergy are not afraid to admit that there is need for experiment in connection with our worship, then it may be hoped that at least the thoughtful laymen will be willing to listen and to co-operate in searching for a solution of our problem, and that some who are prejudiced against a Sung Eucharist might be led to make its acquaintance and ultimately to realize its value.

V. *The question as to the hour of the principal service* is an important one. Mr. Selwyn believes that the problem of Fasting Communion is the crux of this matter, and that only when our national Church has given definite guidance will it be possible to meet the difficulty (see p. 259 ff.). It would seem, however, that it might be wise to avoid, if possible, *commencing* the practice of a Sung Eucharist at the late hour of 11.* Obviously the hour must suit the majority of worshippers. In the writer's parish ten o'clock has been found most suitable. An earlier time would not suit farm-workers, nor the children, many of whom live some distance from the church; a later time would be too late for housewives who are responsible for the Sunday dinner. But whatever time is decided upon, it should be *the same each Sunday in any particular parish*.

In conclusion, can we be altogether satisfied with the system, hardly won though it may have been, of having a Sung Eucharist once a month or on alternate Sundays? At any rate, in parishes where it is contemplated introducing a Choral Eucharist, would it not be well to make every effort to have it *every Sunday* and at a fixed time, and thus proclaim our belief that it is the principal service of the Church? For in seeking a solution of this problem as of any other, "Principles, not Preference" should be our watchword. We do well to take the laity into our confidence and seek their co-operation in these matters, bearing in mind the traditions to which they have been accustomed; but that is not to say that things must always go on as they have in the past, and we shall not deserve the name of leaders if, for fear of coming into conflict with preferences, we fail to proclaim principles and seek to win our people's adherence to them. And surely it should be possible for clergy and laity alike to recognize as a principle that the chief service on the Lord's Day should be the highest act of worship known to the Church, offered at such a time as is most convenient to the majority; a service so built up as to call forth our spiritual and mental activities; and so ordered as to be recognized by all as the Church's supreme act of weekly worship.

The reform cannot be achieved all at once; it must be more generally desired first, but it would be a great gain if the majority of clergy and faithful laity could be brought to recognize the principle, and take it as their guide in all their efforts to provide a worship acceptable to God, agreeable to Catholic usage, and edifying to man.

R. H. SUTCH.

* Dearmer, *Parson's Handbook*, p. 209.

SUNDAY MORNING AND THE CHILDREN

In the midst of great perplexity about the problem of Sunday morning worship and its arrangement, one point has usually received either scant or mistaken attention, and this is the provision of the right training in worship for the children. Usually this is considered as quite a separate problem from that of the arrangement of the Sunday morning Church services, affecting it only in that some provision has to be made for a Sunday morning school of some sort, or for having the children "brought to Church." Actually it would not be hard to maintain that the two problems are one and the same, and that the best arrangement for the whole parish is the arrangement which is the best one for the children. It is at any rate evident that it is sheer blindness to forget that the congregations on Sunday morning ten years hence depend very largely on what we are doing with the children now. Our declining Sunday morning congregations, where they are declining, are due far less to the driving away of elder people by distasteful teaching or practice, which is commonly held to be the only cause, than to the fact that in most cases they have never contained most of the children of the Sunday Schools, since they were about fifteen years of age, at all, and normal casualties are not being made good in consequence.

The solution of the Sunday morning problem, then, is going to be indicated by the needs of the children. This is the case because the only possible way to settle what the children are to do on Sunday morning is to look ten years ahead, to decide what we want these children to be doing then, and forthwith to set them (all of them over eight or nine years of age that is) to do it now. From about nine years of age to about thirteen is the greatest habit-forming period of life, and the associations with Sunday made then will tend to become fixed, and will only with difficulty be erased. This principle, however, needs to be thoroughly understood, for applied without understanding it can be, and generally has been, productive of disastrous consequences. Speaking strictly, what is happening when we are forming habits of this kind is not a process comparable to the exercises of an athlete who by constant, regular, and assiduous practice acquires the habit of performing certain muscular movements with automatic correctness. This would sometimes appear to be the belief of those who insist on the value of mere regularity in Church attendance by children, and who are, or should be, profoundly disturbed by the breakdown of the theory

in experience. What is being formed by the Sunday morning practice of children is groups of ideas associated with "Sunday morning" and "Church." These groups of ideas become charged with emotion, such as delight or dread, interest or boredom; the decisive factor with regard to future conduct is this emotional colouring of the group of ideas: this it is which decides the future habit. Thus childhood's experience of Sunday Church-going may lead to a habit of avoidance of Church-going as easily as to the habit of regular Church attendance, and, it must be urged, frequently does so, for the mind inevitably, and sometimes unconsciously, avoids repetition of an experience which is linked with a group of ideas charged with a disagreeable emotion. Church-going must therefore be made congenial to children; this is not to say that the idea of duty is to be eliminated; the two things are not contradictory, seeing that the experience of duty can be entirely pleasant.

Further, the idea associated with Sunday and Church must be the idea that it is desired to make permanent, not the idea of something else intended to be a preparation for it. Regular attendance at Morning Sunday School, however often the lesson may be about Sunday worship, will not build up a habit of Sunday morning Church-going; nothing but the actual Church-going can do that. Similarly "Children's Services" on Sunday morning, although they may teach much, are not forming the habit of attendance at the ordinary parish services, as has often been found when the time has arrived to draft children on to the latter.

We proceed to ask ourselves, therefore, What is the habit with regard to Sunday morning which we want to build up? Supposing our aim to be at any rate, taking a long view, to lead the child to be in the future a weekly Communicant, this habit will not be forced by exacting weekly attendance at any non-communicating service, be that service Morning Prayer or even a Eucharist, at which there are no communicants. Further, supposing our aim is to train in the habit of attendance at either of these last-named services, we shall fail even in this so long as they are performed in such a way as to be interesting and delightful only to adults. This, however, is what is often done, the children being allotted the worst places in Church, whilst a service is enacted in such a way as to make little or no direct appeal to them.

We can now proceed to review our Sunday morning problem afresh, beginning from the point of view of the need of providing a training for the children. Here are some of the points:

1. We can only have the children in Church once: so if the children are to form the habit of coming to Holy

Communion, one at least of the normal "chief" services must be a Eucharist.

2. Obviously for this purpose the early morning Celebration is not suitable, for children cannot be sent very early.
3. Moreover the service must clearly include some music, some movement, and some simple teaching.
4. The service must be one at which it is normal for many to communicate, for the children must associate the idea of communion with the Eucharist. Here may be added the observation that the reason why it is often found heartbreakingly difficult to induce our boys and girls to become regular communicants is a psychological one. They have had so often no acquaintance at all with the service of Holy Communion; it is not associated at all in their minds with other Sunday by Sunday ideas. They come timidly to a strange service, and to one in the course of which they come out of their seats in a conspicuous way. The whole strain is too much. If they had been accustomed to the service, and to seeing people go to the Altar to communicate, their state of mind would be quite different.

Can we then visualize a chief morning service which will satisfy all the requirements? An attempt will now be made to describe such a service.

The service will be a Parish Communion at some hour early enough for it to be a suitable time for encouraging Communicants and late enough for the children to come—let us say round about 9.30 a.m. The children will be given the seats from which they can most easily see and hear the whole service. Someone, one of the clergy if the Church has a staff, otherwise a chosen layman, will be ready to kneel in the passage in the middle of the children. His chief task will be to help the children to follow the service. For this purpose it is essential that the service book provided for the children shall be exactly followed by the celebrant. As the children come in and take their places (preferably coming in quite naturally and unmarshalled) he will see that each one finds and marks the Collect, Epistle, and Gospel in the Prayer Book, and puts it within reach for use at the proper time. During the service he says at intervals, quite clearly, the number of the page which has been reached, or gives instructions—thus, "page 8," "the Confession on page 16," "Stand for the Gloria on page 28," or, after the Consecration, "You will now like to say the prayers on page 23." These short, clear instructions are quite sufficient to keep the children's attention fixed and

from time to time recalled, whilst experience has shown that this can be done without in the least disturbing the adult congregation. The celebrant knows by arrangement just when to allow a momentary pause—e.g., before the Collect for the Day, when he stays long enough for the assistant to say “Prayer Book—Collect for Advent Sunday.” This collaboration between the Celebrant and the leader of the children is of the utmost importance. The Bidding to prayer before the “Church Militant” prayer can be expanded a little, so as to give the children a general understanding of what is happening in it. So also there may be a brief call to special recollection before the Consecration, or Prayer of Oblation, or Blessing. These brief admonitions can be varied so that different parts of the various prayers are illuminated at different times. The adult congregation benefits as much from such training as the children if it is very shortly and very quietly done, and it may be done either by the celebrant or by the leader in the aisle. This is to be remembered about the Holy Communion Service, that provided the children are aware of the general import of each part of the service and are being gradually trained to perceive the meaning of the words by following in their books, there is not the same need for understanding from the outset the exact meaning of every word and phrase, because, without presupposing elaborate ceremonial, there is enough suggestion in the action of the service to assist their imagination to grasp the essential import. The disadvantage of children’s services is that if they are special simple forms they do not train for the normal service, and if they do not they are superfluous. This is not to condemn all children’s services, and Sunday School offices, which are an important part of children’s training, but it does suggest that the main Sunday morning service had better be the normal service so administered that they can have an intelligent and delightful part. The service itself will be as straightforward as possible, so that the children can follow easily. The Introit might well be a Psalm, and the hymns, not at all necessarily children’s hymns, will all be known to the children, a sufficient variety being obtained by learning them and the music of the service in the afternoon Sunday School. The setting of the service will be one in all of which the children can join: Merbecke is of course admirable, as are other simple congregational settings, and it will not be frequently changed, and never until the children know and can join in it.

There will be a very brief—not more than five minutes—sermon in the appointed place, and this will be addressed to the children, notwithstanding the presence of a larger number of adults. In such a simple sermon the leading point of the Gospel

of the day can be dealt with or some point in the teaching of the service, and often the two linked—e.g., the Advent Sunday Gospel with the Benedictus, or a miracle of healing with the Prayer of the Church Militant. Once again experience shows that the adult congregation appreciates this simple teaching as much as the children, and, of course, often a special message for the adults can be interwoven.

The children can very soon be trained to stand very quietly during the Communion of the people and sing the hymn. Exception may be taken to the idea of the children standing at this point in the service, but the time occupied in the communicating of a number of people is too long for them to be kept kneeling, and reverent standing is easier for them than reverent kneeling, and reverence is the objective, not any particular posture. For the same reason the practice of letting the whole congregation stand from the Sursum Corda to the end of the Benedictus is sometimes adopted.

This in outline is what is meant by a Parish Communion, in which both adults and children take part together. Mattins would either be said before this service or sung at a later hour, but the children would not be expected to attend. If it be urged that it is a pity for the children to miss the Psalms and Lessons of Morning Prayer, it must be replied that:

1. Reflection will show that these very lessons and Psalms are peculiarly difficult for children, and that indeed the Divine Office was devised for folk rather advanced in devotional and theological experience; on the whole the Eucharist is a distinctly "easier" service. And—
2. As has already been pointed out, since we must choose one, and only one, service for the children's Sunday morning, this service must be the one of which the practice in later life is of the greatest importance.

The question of a choir at such a service arises, for often it is difficult to get a choir at such an hour as has been suggested. As a matter of fact the desirability of a choir is by no means certain. Somehow or other a choir in its stalls seems to find devotion peculiarly difficult, and it is fatal to the atmosphere of the service to have anything in the least degree short of absolute reverence set right in front of the children. Moreover, for the sake of the choir-boys, it is better for them to sit with the other children and be led in their devotions along with them. It is also certain that many people find the distraction of going up to the Altar rails at the time of the Communion between the double rows of the choir very disturbing. On the

whole, therefore, it would seem quite desirable for the choir stalls to be empty at a communicating service. The singing will then be led from the body of the Church and be entirely congregational; it will be possible often to have a Singing Guild of Communicants (of which the ordinary members of the choir can be members along with others) who will sit together in the body of the Church and lead the singing.

The details given are of the very greatest importance. Their cumulative effect is to make the service a joyful experience to the children. They are neither overwhelmed by being "handled" by well-meaning, but unknowledgeable, teachers (though adults may with great advantage sit amongst them to show the way of devotion by being themselves devout), nor left to themselves to be bored by having to keep still whilst unintelligible things take place all around them, but they are led to follow the service in their books and co-operate in it. The help given consists, it will be seen, mainly in:

1. The giving of enough short extra "rubric" (if the term may be allowed for the short phrases of explanation used before each main prayer).
2. The guiding to the finding of places by supplying books and announcing pages.
3. The short sermon putting a living idea behind some part of the service.
4. The use of music in which they can fully join.

The foregoing is a description in outline of an actual experiment in an industrial parish in the Midlands; it no doubt corresponds broadly with the arrangements in many other parishes which have tried the same plan. The results in the particular parish were so encouraging as to deserve to be summarized here in support of the contention that such a service provides the solution of the Sunday morning problem. Thus it was found that whereas before the establishment of this service every Sunday it was extraordinarily hard to get the adolescents of the parish to Church on Sunday morning at all, when the service had been established for a few years 30 per cent. of the whole congregation would be between the ages of fourteen and twenty. At one time there was the difficulty, a very usual one, of getting more than a woefully small proportion (say one in three) of the newly confirmed really to form a habit of regular Communion, and of keeping even a smaller proportion after a year or two. The psychological reason for this has been suggested above, and the facts in this instance bore out the contention in a remarkable way. Very carefully kept records showed exclusively that the fact of having attended the Parish Com-

munion for the years immediately preceding Confirmation had indeed tended to form a habit; the numbers of newly confirmed who continued to attend the service, and to communicate at it represented four out of five during the first year after Confirmation, and three out of five eventually. These figures are not claimed as being the highest possible attainment, but they do represent a most significant improvement on what is, it is believed, the common experience. Nor was the gain confined to the matter of numbers; both during the time of preparation for first Communion and afterwards the advance in the level of intelligent devotion was very marked. The further point can also be pressed home from this instance—namely, that the solution which was the best for the training of the children proved to be the best for the parish. The service rapidly came to be the recognized centre of the Sunday's worship, and no section of the parishioners welcomed it more than working mothers who were able to come after having given breakfast to their children and before cooking the Sunday dinner. And the parish has reason to suppose that a generation is growing up which has the idea of a delightful experience of Eucharistic worship, at a communicating service shared by young and old, associated with the idea of Sunday morning.

But it is not supposed that every parish priest will consider that this arrangement fulfils the needs of his particular parish, and it will be well to urge the broad general principle for application to different local conditions. This principle is that the main Sunday morning act of worship shall be carried out with the training of the children as its main consideration. Some of the principles already enunciated will be capable of application in the case of—

1. A late solemn Eucharist.
2. Morning Prayer.
3. Morning Prayer to the Benedictus, followed by Sung Eucharist;

and indeed the value of any of these services as a training ground for future worshippers depends entirely on the degree to which they are so applied.

For example, the question of the children's seating must be taken in hand in each case. There is of course a great deal to be said for children sitting with their parents; but unfortunately the vast majority of the parents are not there, and so the children have to be together somewhere; this arrangement has nothing to say for itself if it is merely a device for putting the children somewhere out of the way, tucking them into a side aisle where they can see least and come least under

the spell of the conductor of the service. It is an arrangement full of usefulness if the children are given the front seats of the nave where they can see the Altar, hear all that is said, and above all be where the clergy can with least delay and fuss give them help in following the service. How this help may be given need not be considered again with reference to a late Sung Eucharist, but it may be remarked that no consideration whatever should prevent it from being given, for otherwise there is a real danger of serious fatigue of mind, especially when, as is very often the case, the music is of such a kind as to be quite beyond them, and so there is but little in the service in which they can really take an active part. On the whole, we may feel inclined to say that where the parish is of such a kind that such an elaborate service is deemed necessary, it would be well to have an earlier Eucharist of the type previously described, not called a Children's Eucharist, but being accounted one of the normal Parish services and with communicants encouraged. This last point is once again emphasized for, apart from all other considerations, the present writer is certain that nothing suggests the habit of Communion to children so strongly as seeing others communicate; the parish priest who hopes to teach Communion by attendance at a non-communicating service accompanied by teaching in Catechism on the importance of communicating is committing a well-meant but serious error. Similarly with the Mattins to the Benedictus Eucharist arrangement: we may consider that all that so far has been said is strictly applicable and sufficient. For it is probably clear that this whole service cannot take less than an hour and a half, which is too long for children, who will therefore only come in during the Benedictus in time for the Eucharist. The entry of the children can be made simple and dignified; we want to avoid any use of the time just before entry which will give the wrong atmosphere, consequently assembly at some spot other than the church door and a united entry seems inevitable in this case. It is well to avoid the term "march in," to avoid a wrong suggestion of constraint and regimentation which is not wanted, whereas order, of course, is. A rehearsal of the entry from time to time with the idea given of seeing how quiet it can be made will probably appeal to the children and produce a good effect, whereas "marching" is associated in their minds with a good deal of noise and bustle suitable in its place, but not in Church.

With reference to Mattins—the writer has made no attempt to disguise his opinion that this is not the right service for children: nevertheless if the particular parish priest has resolved otherwise, it is at least possible to give vastly more help to the

children than is usually attempted. What has already been emphasized about seating of course applies to Mattins, and with this special point, that at Mattins the officiating clergy can and ought to give the kind of special quasi-rubrical help to the children of which mention has already been made, helping them to find Psalms, Lessons, and Collects. If a book of prefatory notes to the Psalms and Lessons were authorized in a diocese, it might be a great help to the children and to adults to have a few sentences of explanation; in this case the explanations would have to be devised with a view to the mind of the child of about nine or ten. The chief difficulty arises with regard to the Sermon. Probably the solution would best be found along the line, not unknown in other Communions than our own, of having a brief address for the children, after which they leave Church before the main service. In this case the boys of the choir should be allowed to go too. The time is ripe for a very serious consideration of the way in which we treat our choir-boys; their Sunday is generally most terribly overloaded with religious observances into very little of which they do, or possibly can, enter in any real way. In addition to all that we expect of other children they have one (the evening) whole service added and sometimes two, and in addition to this they acquire, except where the greatest care is taken, a fundamentally unreal attitude towards worship—stated psychologically the idea of “worship” is associated with the idea of “performance,” and the emotional tone is all wrong. In this connection it may be suggested that where the early Parish Communion is followed by a Sung Mattins the choir-boys should leave the church after the Third Collect.

Now this whole idea of treating the arrangement of Sunday morning worship from the point of view of the children's training makes a big, but, it is urged, a very proper and possible, demand on the whole congregation.

On the one hand, it must be insisted that nothing which has been suggested need, if carefully applied, spoil the services, from the point of view of the adult; rather it should definitely enhance their value. Only actual experience and trial will convince critics of the beautiful stillness and reverence of children properly taught and handled at the Eucharist; their presence right in front of the congregation need be no distraction to anyone; the presence and speaking of the leader in the aisle is a thing to which everyone becomes rapidly accustomed, and most of the congregation will be soon quite unaware of what he is doing if he kneels in the right place—i.e., behind rather than in front of the children—and is therefore able to be heard when speaking softly but distinctly. The special attention given by

the celebrant or officiating minister at Mattins to the children will serve far more as an aid to reality than as a hindrance in any way.

It is true that a certain demand is being made on the congregation—e.g., to give up the best seats, to forego elaborate music, to have, on the whole, a “simpler” service, to suffer the entrance or departure of the children, to sing a final hymn at Mattins in unison because of the absence of choir-boys, but all these things represent a sacrifice which a congregation ought to be willing to make in order to provide for the proper training of the children.

On all sides we hear of the scanty proportions of morning congregations. No doubt half the Church Councils in the country bewail the fact from time to time in their deliberations. Let the appeal be made to them to face the situation. The remedy chiefly lies in training the habit of Sunday morning worship in the children of to-day, that it may bear fruit in ten years’ time. What is quite certain is that, as things are at present, hardly one child in ten at present in our Sunday Schools is forming that habit, for reasons that were given at the beginning of this article. There is a way to save the situation if we are really in earnest in our anxiety, and are willing to pay the price.

A. R. BROWNE-WILKINSON.

THE HOLY COMMUNION IN COUNTRY PARISHES

In what I have to say about the very important subject of Communion there will probably be very little which does not apply equally to a working-class town parish. There are certainly greater difficulties in the country, where there is often a long distance to come, and where there is much less difference between Sunday and week-day in the life of the worker. The long distance between the people’s homes and the church, and the work that has to be done in the country on Sunday and week-day alike, make the duty of communion much more difficult for country people. If those facts are borne in mind, it will be understood that much that follows applies not less to a town than to a country parish.

I may perhaps be allowed to say something at the outset about the tremendous importance of communion in view of modern conditions. Are we not coming to realize that much

that we have taught in the past, to confirmation candidates and to others, about the practice of the Christian religion needs to be revised? On the one hand, whether we will or no, we have to reckon with the increased complexity of modern life; with the changing view of the obligation of Sunday; with the very much larger provision of Sunday amusement and facilities for Sunday travelling. On the other hand, within the Church itself, there has been the great increase in the frequency of opportunity of communion both on Sundays and week-days; there has come to be a much greater realization of the importance of preparation and of thanksgiving; there has been a great increase in the habit of what is called "non-communicating attendance"; there has been the very general practice of Reservation, opening up great vistas of the possibilities of communion outside the Mass. I am not contending that any of these things are good or bad in themselves, I am not arguing for or against them; I am simply stating that they are facts which have to be reckoned with.

Moreover, there has come about a great change both in practice and in teaching as to what should be the service on Sunday morning midway between breakfast and dinner, and, not only so, it has also become increasingly difficult to secure the attendance upon which we used to lay such stress, whether at Mattins or Mass. We must face this; we must have a policy about it; we must help those whom we teach to see clearly for themselves what they ought to do, or what, with a good conscience, they may allow themselves not to do.

It is necessary to say all this at the outset in order to clear the ground. The subject entrusted to me is the subject of Holy Communion, and if I speak of that only and of what is strictly connected with it, it must not be thought that I am forgetting, still less depreciating, either the Divine Office or such things as Litany, Catechism, Class, non-liturgical services of various kinds. They do not come within the limits of my "terms of reference," and that must be borne in mind if I seem to leave very important things on one side. I will only go outside these limits in order to say very emphatically that I must in no sense be thought to imply that the Divine Office, as represented for us by the daily Mattins and Evensong, is not of the greatest importance, I cannot help regretting that the *morning* office at any rate is so often said privately on a week-day with no bell "tolled thereto." I recognize the many difficulties in the way of saying it publicly before the daily Mass; I recognize that it is binding on the clergy only; but I think that there are very distinct advantages in making it *in intention* a public office, even though so few come, or can come, to say it with the

THEOLOGY

priest. This is by the way, but I say it lest I should be misunderstood, especially when I go on to say what really sums up the whole of what I am trying to say in this article: "Take care of the Mass, and the rest of Sunday will take care of itself." I mean that no one who has been taught to make his communion regularly and devoutly every Sunday, or at least to be present when not prepared to communicate, will ever be content to restrict his observance of the Lord's Day to the early hour before breakfast.

I should wish to emphasize those words "regularly and devoutly." "Regularly" means according to one's rule whatever one's rule may be, whether once a month or once a week; "devoutly" means with due preparation, reverent attention, faith in the promises of God, regular thanksgiving.

We must then, first of all, teach our people to have a rule and to keep to it. We must point out that belonging to a society we are bound to keep its rules. And the rule of the Divine Society is that we must be present at the Lord's Service, "commonly called the Mass," on every Lord's Day. Our own part of the Catholic Church requires communion at least three times a year. We start with that; presence at the Mass every Sunday, communion at least thrice in the year. With that in our minds, let us suppose that we suggest to our confirmation candidates that while they make a strict rule of being present every Sunday they should, at least to begin with, make a further rule to make their communion regularly and devoutly once a month, with the intention of increasing the frequency of communion by degrees until it becomes a weekly privilege and duty. I do not think that we ought to despise the old-fashioned expression "Sacrament Sunday." I feel sure, much as I desire that our people should be frequent communicants, that a communion only once a month carefully prepared for is much better than much more frequent communion to which little thought or preparation has been given. The ideal to be aimed at is *at least* once a week, but we must often be content to attain to that ideal by degrees.

With this in our minds, it is well to make a great deal of Sacrament Sunday—let us call it the first Sunday in the month. I should like to say, by the way, what I said before about the Mass itself, that I have found by experience that if you take great care with the monthly communion the weekly communion will take care of itself; you will increase weekly communions by emphasizing the monthly one.

How will you do that? That is the question which brings us to practical details. They will group themselves under three heads: reminder, preparation, fellowship.

1. REMINDER.—Not necessarily for all, but certainly for young communicants, a monthly reminder is, I think, very valuable. It is, I think, a little unreasonable to say that they ought not to need reminding. Of course they ought not. But it is a great help to all of us to be reminded of an engagement or a duty of any kind. It takes the form, with us, of a printed card which *can* be sent, only if absolutely necessary, by the halfpenny post, but will be much better taken by the parish priest himself. It will have its additional value to *him* that it will ensure his visiting at least once a month all the communicants under his charge. If the parish is too scattered for a monthly visit to every one by the parish priest himself, he can welcome the help of good people who will gladly take notices to those in their immediate neighbourhood. He may even find it a good plan to divide the communicants into bands or wards under the care of one of their own number. The card will be simply a reminder in the fewest and simplest words possible. What it has on it will bring us to the two remaining heads by which we try to emphasize the monthly communion:

2. PREPARATION.—It reminds them of the need of preparation in the form of the monthly service to which all communicants are invited. The ideal day is Saturday at 7 or 8 o'clock, but in most parishes Friday is the nearest day to Sunday on which the people can come. It will be mainly for prayer and acts of faith and penitence said by all, but it will often be found a good opportunity for instruction as well. It might be thought, and many very good parish priests do think, that the common preparation may tend to become a substitute for the individual preparation, whatever form it takes, which every communicant must make for himself. I can only give my experience. I have always found that those who valued the united preparation most were those who were accustomed to make their confessions in the presence of a priest, that it was valuable for teaching people to make their own preparation, and that it ensured some preparation at least for those who otherwise made little or none.

Much that I have said about public preparation is true also about public thanksgiving, but it applies to *every* Sunday. It is a great help to a right understanding of what communion is, if the priest, immediately after the service on Sunday morning, having removed his vestment or surplice, goes down and kneels among the people and says with them some psalms and prayers of thanksgiving. Again, I can only give my own experience. When it was begun in a London church some good people assured me that it would tend to take the place of individual thanksgiving. It had exactly the opposite effect. Instead of a great

exodus from the church directly the priest left the altar, not only did the whole congregation remain for the public thanksgiving, which was very short, but many of them stayed on after it, engaged in their devotions.

3. FELLOWSHIP.—Can we do anything to restore the Agape ? I think we can. We began in London by asking boys and young men to come into the clergy-house to breakfast after the monthly corporate communion, but of course this could only be done on a very small scale. In the country we began a common meal in the Village Hall for any who liked to come, though it was chiefly boys who did so; we hope that this will develop into something really good and useful.

In Chester Cathedral about thirty boys gather together in the Refectory for what is called the fellowship of the common meal once a month after their corporate communion. In a parish in the Midlands again, the common meal takes place *every* Sunday, which is perhaps the ideal. We cannot here go into detail. We will only express our conviction that there are in this modern form of Agape great possibilities of a very wonderful fellowship having its roots back in the mystical fellowship before the Altar in the communion of the One Bread, carrying it out, as it were, into the ordinary everyday life, and interpreting it in terms of human fellowship one with another. No doubt it has its dangers too, but they are very easily guarded against, and once there is the right spirit among our communicants the danger, if there be any, will vanish altogether.

WEEK-DAY COMMUNION.—I do not think that we can expect in country parishes—at any rate in those which are chiefly agricultural—that very great use will be made of week-day communion. The great use and blessing of the daily Mass is that it enables the parish priest to take his part in the pleading of the Great Sacrifice for all the sins and all the needs of all the world, to enable him to bring into the great tide of intercession “ ascending up before God out of the Angels’ hand ” the sorrows and the joys, the needs and the aspirations, of his own people. And of course there will always be present to the minds of devout people in the parish the fact that there is the daily opportunity of “ communion and offering ” ready and waiting for them whenever they wish and are able to avail themselves of it.

But whether it is true or not that we cannot expect very great use to be made of week-day communion, at any rate in agricultural parishes, there are certain things which we ought to remember about it: (i.) The possibility of frequent and even daily communion ought always to be in the mind of the priest who knows that one great part of his work is the training of saints, and that there is material for that training, little as

we may suspect it, in every parish; (ii.) as has already been said, the Reservation of the most holy Sacrament does open up a great vista of the possibility of communion, especially on weekdays, outside the Mass. We may find it to be not only a way out of the difficulty, experienced by so many of our men, in getting to the regular parish communion, even on Sundays, but it may often prove to be the solution of the difficulty, felt by many, of the length of the service in which the Canon has to be said, which cannot be said with reverence in the very short time at their disposal. I know of one man who from time to time, on his way to work, very early in the morning, goes into a London church and, in the fitting and beautiful setting of Cranmer's "Order of Communion," receives the Food of Immortality reserved, for him not less than for the sick, in the place appointed, and goes on his way rejoicing. Surely there must be others whose difficulty might be met in the same way. (iii.) There is no inherent impossibility in week-day communion even for folk who have to work hard with their hands for their daily bread. Can anyone forget the sight of a London church at 6 a.m. on Ascension Day or on the Patronal Feast, or of the church of a little country parish with fifty people making their communion at 5 a.m. on the same great Festivals? Or of the same church filled with people for the midnight Mass on Christmas Day, many of them making their communion, the rest of them preparing to make it at one or other of the communions later in the morning? No: week-day communions are not impossible even in working-class parishes.

To recapitulate:

1. We can hardly over-estimate the importance of communion.
2. It must be "regular and devout."
3. Regularity, alike for those who communicate frequently and for those who communicate once a month, is helped and not hindered by emphasis laid on the corporate communion once a month. Reminders of this "Sacrament Sunday" should be given on printed cards, delivered, if possible by the parish priest himself, at the house of each communicant.
4. Helps to devotion may be found in (i.) the preparation service; (ii.) the thanksgiving after communion; (iii.) the fellowship emphasized by the common meal.
5. Week-day communion; a great ideal to be aimed at; the use of the reserved Sacrament; the Mass at an early hour on the great festivals.

H. V. S. ECK.

THE FARNHAM CONFERENCE ON RESERVATION

"THE objective of the Conference was not a discussion on Reservation in general, but an attempt to clear our minds in regard to the theological implications of the use of the Reserved Sacrament as a focus of 'devotions' in the hope of stimulating students in the Church of England to unprejudiced inquiry. No effort was made to reach an 'agreed statement,' or to formulate definite judgments." The Report of the Conference* fully bears out this statement of its objects and of the limits within which the discussion moved. Papers were read covering very wide areas of theology and history. But both papers and discussions alike converged upon certain practical issues thus defined in the opening words of the Chairman's Introduction. The theological implications of "devotions" were the main issue. But this in turn involved much discussion of the Real Presence and of almost the whole field of Eucharistic theology and liturgical practice. The weight of the Conference was very decidedly against "devotions," as was to be expected from its composition. Interest, however, naturally attaches to some of the leading positions taken up by prominent members of the Conference in support of this negative conclusion. Of particular interest, in this connection, were the paper read by Canon Quick, the careful summary by the Bishop of Gloucester, and the contributions of the Bishop of Manchester. Only four members pleaded for toleration of devotions in some form. But a combination which includes Bishop Gore, Professor Gouge, and Dr. Stone is one which ought to carry great weight. It is unfortunate that no parish priest was present with a first-hand parochial experience of the practices discussed and of their effect upon the spiritual life of a populous district. Two further points of general interest may be noted. The first is the very deliberate way in which Dr. Headlam, summarizing the discussions of the Conference, emphatically repudiated the charges of idolatry and superstition which have recently been made against Anglo-Catholics. The second is the fact that no one raised objection to permanent reservation for the purpose of communion (see especially Canon Streeter's statement on pp. 14, 15).

Dr. Stone, in his paper, stated his position clearly and forcibly. He presented the case in that simplicity and in-

* Reservation. Report of a Conference held at Farnham Castle on October 24-27, 1925. S.P.C.K.

tensity with which it is apprehended by Catholic devotion. Yet no one is more aware than he (our acknowledged historical expert) how intricate and complicated the subject becomes when theologians, philosophers, and liturgical scholars have said their say. This double aspect of the subject was indeed referred to more than once in the Conference (cp. Canon Quick, quoting a striking passage from Tyrrell, pp. 22, 23; and Canon Streeter's remarks on the little child and the sophisticated person in all of us, p. 157). Yet somehow devotion and theology have to settle accounts with each other, and this is the real crux of the problem with which the Conference set itself to grapple. Two lines of thought were specially prominent, those which concern respectively the Real Presence and the Gift in Holy Communion. Both questions are contained *simpliciter* in Dr. Stone's words: "It seems to me a really helpful belief that in the Eucharist we receive our Lord Himself, and that He comes to us, and is as accessible to us, and as really as to His disciples in Galilee" (p. 70). The two questions can be dealt with separately, although of course they can and must be brought together ultimately.

I

A great deal was said in the Conference about the character and conditions of our Lord's Presence in the Sacrament. We may start from Dr. Stone's quotations of official Roman teaching: "The body of Christ is not locally (*localiter*) in the Sacrament of the altar" (St. Thomas). "Christ the Lord is not in this Sacrament as in a place" (Catechism of the Council of Trent). "Our Lord is *in loco* in heaven, not (in the same sense) in the Sacrament." "He is present only in substance." "He does not move. He is in the Holy Eucharist after the manner of a spirit" (Cardinal Newman). Canon Quick, in his paper, seemed to think that this teaching is irreconcilable with the traditional attitude of Catholic devotion towards the Blessed Sacrament. Theology speaks with one voice, devotion with another (cp. the quotation from Tyrrell referred to above). But we shall do well not to adopt this conclusion too hurriedly. For if theology and devotion have really given such radically divergent witness we should be brought very near to the brink of scepticism on the whole matter, and not only on this matter, but perhaps on even more fundamental questions. The same writer stated somewhat dogmatically that transubstantiation was a spiritual doctrine devised to buttress a materialistic devotion; and it was suggested that this was at bottom a dishonest alliance which could not be justified (pp. 22, 23). No serious evidence was brought forward to corroborate this view, and at best it seems

to be a rash generalization from facts about which we can know very little. (Contrast the more balanced statement of Dr. Headlam on p. 35). The reading of history offered to us in Canon Quick's paper is surely very difficult, if not psychologically impossible. It gives the impression of being much too *facile*. For the framers of the transubstantiation theology were either (1) sharers in the materialistic devotion, who yet provided a spiritual theology contradictory thereto; or (2) critics of the materialistic devotion who yet came to its assistance with a contradictory theology; or (3) it remains that their own devotion to the Blessed Sacrament was spiritual and formed the reasonable basis of a spiritual theology. Now we may fairly maintain that the first two propositions are highly improbable. As to the third, it is borne out by the hymn *Lauda Sion* commonly attributed to St. Thomas; and if this third proposition is nearest to the truth, it suggests that there was a spiritual devotion in existence at the time. But if so, then a doctrine like that of transubstantiation is not only spiritual itself, but has and had affinities with spiritual types of experience upon which it was grounded. Consequently the whole theory of theology allying itself with materialistic devotion falls to the ground. For how can materialistic tendencies (always near at hand in all types of religion) be adequately combated, if not by a spiritual theology grounding itself upon spiritual experience?

These considerations have a much greater importance and wider relevance than that of a purely historical question. We think Canon Goudge was right here as against Canon Streeter (pp. 12-14). The latter indeed exactly reversed the true state of the case when he declared that the question of the "Ambrosian" versus the "Augustinian" view is of no practical importance, but that what matters is the practical danger of Anglicanism being assimilated to Rome. Does this mean that even if the "Ambrosian" view were true, it would be better to act as if the "Augustinian" view were true for fear of approximation to Rome? If so, this is pragmatism with a vengeance! These historical questions are still important, not because we can think in the old terms, but precisely because Eucharistic theology is once again in solution and consequently all the old problems come crowding upon us for readjustment. Of these problems one of the most important is this: Can a reasonable and spiritual doctrine of the Real Presence be made to bear the weight of eucharistic adoration, when that phrase is understood to mean the general attitude of devotional sentiment and practice towards the consecrated gifts which (apart from particular forms of devotion) has characterized the Catholic tradition?

Adoration is a corollary of the Real Presence. But this Presence is vouchsafed to us for the purposes of the whole eucharistic rite. These purposes are broadly two, Commemorative Sacrifice and Communion in the sacrificial gifts. The full meaning of such phrases would require further scrutiny; but the definition is provisionally adequate. For it means that the Presence must be regarded in relation to its whole context and the conditions which are there indicated. On this point the Conference appears to have been agreed, although of course the principle received divergent interpretations. It is agreed, then, that the Presence has for its context the whole liturgical action of the eucharist, and that the sacred gifts must not be considered out of all relation to that action. Further, the sacrament is reserved for Communion, and when so reserved is in relation to the whole eucharistic rite and fulfils one of its purposes. The extended use of the Sacrament is an extension of the temporal and spatial conditions normally surrounding the rite. But these are secondary; there is no breach in the higher unities of purpose. There is also another side to the question of context. If the Presence is in the context of the rite, the rite itself is the corporate action of the believing and worshipping Church; so that the fullest participation in the rite can only be made by the individual when he receives the gifts with devout dispositions of faith and penitence. Further, the priest celebrates and communicates, not as a solitary individual, but as the representative of the worshipping Church; and the entire action is the action of Christ present as High Priest in the whole rite, in His Body the Church and its organs, and in the believing hearts of his people. The context of action involves a context of persons and is grounded upon the Divine Person of the Son. All these are conditions, objective conditions, surrounding the gift of the Presence. Thus far it would appear that the Conference was prepared to move together.

All this, however, is not the Real Presence, but its context. In that context, as we have seen, there appear other types and grades of presence, personal, active, purposive. But all of these find their focussing point in the sacramental objects or gifts. The climax of the liturgical action is in an *event* (the Consecration) which effects a change in the character and status of these objects. The divergent theories of East and West about the Consecration do not differ on this point. Both agree in regarding Consecration as an event in the time-series at a definite point in the service. The Consecration involves a Coming which is also an act of God in time, and the Coming effects a Presence which is given under the forms of bread and wine. The Real Presence, then, is not diffused vaguely throughout the service.

But neither is it "localized." It is manifested *here* and *now* in the order of time and space. But it is not restricted by that order. It is both immanent and transcendent; and this is true of all modes of God's Presence in creation. He is present in nature, but not localized. In the Old Testament His Presence was manifested in particular places, but not localized. God incarnate was present in the womb of His Mother, in houses and Synagogues of Galilee, in the upper room and upon the Cross, but in all this His Presence was not localized, for the heaven of heavens cannot contain Him. He is present in the worshipping congregation and in the heart of the Christian saint. He is in the midst where they are gathered. Their bodies are confined within walls, and He is present to them within those walls; but *He* is not so confined. And these various modes of presence involve a number of quite distinct conceptions which we express by correspondingly distinct words, such as immanence, theophany, incarnation, indwelling. To these modes must be added that of the eucharistic presence which presupposes all the others. Like each of them, it has its own special characteristics which are determined by the facts of the institution. But none the less it exhibits the same principles. Christ is present in the sacramental species. They are *in loco*, but He is not. He is not subject to their spatio-temporal conditions, yet He is truly there, where they are. Thus the devotional language which speaks of Christ as being "upon the altar" is justifiable, however carefully it needs to be guarded by theological statements about supra-locality. Otto went so far as to urge that religion knows only particular presences of God, and that the idea of omnipresence is a barren piece of rationalism. This is an over-statement which can easily be refuted from the Old Testament. It would be truer to say that normally men first find God in some moment of experience or in some hallowed spot or in relation to some sacred object, and that a more reflective stage of spiritual development finds a wider background for this. Thus devotion and thought are mutual aids to right faith. The little child and the sophisticated person of whom Canon Streeter spoke are necessary to one another. Is not this one more instance of that tension between religion and scientific thought which, as Von Hügel saw, is so necessary if each is to yield up its verdict without distortion?

II

The other main subject of discussion was the nature of the Gift in Holy Communion. Here the Conference was very disappointing. The drift of its discussions on this subject is well

reflected in the reverent agnosticism of Dr. Headlam's summary. The conclusion seems to be entirely negative. We cannot really know what the words of institution mean or what bearing St. John vi. has upon the subject. We cannot know in what relation our Lord stands to His own Gifts. The impression left upon the mind by this attitude is deplorable. Dr. Headlam's position is very near to pragmatism. We are justified in carrying out the directions of the Prayer Book. But any attempt at a speculative theology, which might give a *rationale* of what we are doing, and thus determine the legitimate range of *praxis*, is apparently dangerous. But unfortunately the speculations continue. Dr. Temple thinks that the conditions of the Last Supper preclude the more usual interpretation of our Lord's words. Our Lord present in His natural body could not have given *that* body. So He does not now give His glorified body (p. 132).* The position is similar to that taken up some years ago by Dr. Lucius Waterman, whose book *The Eucharistic Body and Blood* was the first, we think, in recent times to deal with the subject on new lines. Readers of THEOLOGY will be familiar with some of these new lines of thought through the illuminating contributions of Mr. Spens and the Editor of this Journal. Some materials for a reasonable solution are to be found in Mr. Spens' contribution to *Essays Catholic and Critical* and in Mr. Selwyn's contribution to the Farnham Conference. In this connection it seems right to protest against the very cavalier and summary dismissal by the Bishop of Oxford (as reported on p. 97) of a quotation from Mr. Spens which appears on p. 82. No doubt the Bishop's remarks are not given *verbatim*. But if he has been fairly reported, it can only be said that such contemptuous dismissal of a reasoned argument can hardly carry much weight.

The argument that St. Paul in 1 Cor. x.-xii. must have been using the word Body with the same or a similar meaning alike for the Church and the Eucharist cannot be pressed. In explaining the word Body it appears to make nonsense of the phrase "Body and Blood." St. Paul never describes the Church as the Body and Blood of Christ, whereas he uses the phrase more than once in referring to the Eucharist. So far this careful distinction of language points away from Dr. Temple's interpretation, not towards it. It is true that "we are all one bread, one body" (*εἰς, ἐν*), but only "because we all partake of the one bread" (*ἐκ τοῦ ἐνός* [1 Cor. x.]; note the article). Ephraim is a cake not turned, and the Messiah the true Bread from heaven; so the New Israel feeding on that Bread is a loaf. In the same way

* See further, *Christus Veritas*, chapter xiii., for a fuller statement of the argument.

Israel is an unfruitful vine and Christ is the True Vine. St. Paul comes near to the ideas of St. John vi. and xv. in this passage. But these Old Testament ideas are not elaborated by St. Paul as is the case with St. John. The idea of the Head and the Body which St. Paul *does* elaborate in ch. xii. and elsewhere in his epistles is quite distinct and its imagery is quite different. Of course, it is possible that in chapter xii. St. Paul is consciously taking up the word "body" already used in chapter x.; but even so, is this more than a chance association, and can we safely build our theology upon a rabbinic play upon words, particularly when the interpretation offered appears to make nonsense of the key-phrase "Body and Blood"? As to the meaning of this phrase the present writer is in agreement with the interpretation given by Mr. Selwyn on p. 81: "By His 'Body' our Lord meant and means that which makes Him accessible to us, and by His 'Blood' that He was to be and is accessible to us as our sacrificial Food, communicating to us His own Life"; but with the proviso that this interpretation is compatible with the important observation of Mr. Spens:

In the only sense in which we can still think of our Lord's glorified body as identical with His natural body, we must, however, think of His sacramental body as identical with that body. The identity between our Lord's glorified body and His natural body must be held to consist in the facts that opportunities of experience which each includes, and normally conditions, are directly determined by that nature which our Lord assumed at His Incarnation; and that in each case the whole complex of opportunities of experience exists as such in immediate dependence on that nature and affords immediately an expression of it. All this is, however, also the case in regard to the Eucharistic body and blood (*Essays Catholic and Critical*, p. 442).

We conclude, then, that the consecrated gifts are "trans-made" or "transmuted" or "transvaluated" into the New Humanity of Christ, that New Humanity which was born of the Virgin, sacrificed on Calvary, and glorified at the Resurrection. Anything less than this renders the language of St. John vi. intolerably provocative and meaningless. We have to remember, too, that (by its own testimony) the teaching of that chapter is to be interpreted in the light of the Ascension (v. 62). The "Flesh and Blood" of which the discourse speaks belong to the order of the Ascended Life. What else, then, can it mean but the glorified humanity? And if we accept this as the meaning of the discourse, then we must go further. "I am the Bread of Life." "He that eateth Me, he also shall live because of Me." We must surely agree with Canon Quick's view that we cannot separate the Lord from His Body (pp. 128-9). St. John insists that to eat His Flesh and Blood is to eat Him. In reply

it was urged that such language is "highly figurative" (p. 138). But is Dr. Headlam prepared to press that argument in interpreting St. John's Gospel as a whole? The Gospel is saturated with symbolical language. Are we precluded from drawing conclusions for Christian doctrine wherever this is the case? We cannot know all that is meant by "eating" Christ. But the words must mean something not less real and definite than the act of eating material bread, something in its own order infinitely more significant. The mystical theology of St. John is woven round historical facts. Even if the discourse is to be attributed wholly to the mind of the Evangelist, we must still conclude that it gives us his considered interpretation of the Eucharist, and in particular of the words of institution.

III

One or two final impressions of this report may be recorded. Why did the Conference mistrust the attitude of mind which welcomes the opportunity of adoring Christ present in the Reserved Sacrament?

1. Probably the fear of materialism was in many minds. Such devotion is thought to be a craving for "the physical nearness of the Lord" (Canon Quick, p. 22). We must not make the mistake of underrating the danger of materialism here as elsewhere in religion. But we may fairly suspect that along with this fear often goes an over-refined view of the whole meaning of Christianity and a shrinking back from the full implications of the Incarnation with its gospel of redemption for the material order. It is not a craving for "the physical nearness of the Lord" which draws Christian people to the Eucharist. We all of us crave for His *spiritual* nearness; and the rite itself provides the physical or material conditions through which that spiritual nearness is guaranteed. But if this is a true account of our eucharistic experience, how can a craving for spiritual nearness be changed into a craving for physical nearness under conditions where the focus of attraction is the same?

2. With all that was said at the Conference about the conditions and context of the Presence the present writer has the warmest sympathy. But the principle is capable of much wider application. It is not only the Reserved Sacrament which must be related to its true context in the eucharistic rite. The Eucharist itself and the sacramental system as a whole must be properly related to the Christian view of life seen in its true proportions. Dr. Headlam's criticism on pp. 153, 154 is, therefore, altogether misleading: "The whole

of this cult is removed from the ethical implications of our Lord's ministry." It is not "this cult" more than any other part of the Christian cultus which is to blame. The whole of our modern Christianity is deeply deficient in this respect. A piety which is unsocial and non-moral may be found at the musically rendered Sunday Mattins or in the revivalist mission-hall. On the other hand, in some churches with which the present writer is acquainted, in which the Blessed Sacrament is reserved and "devotions" are in use, a passionately ethical gospel is preached. Generally speaking, the revival of devotion to the Blessed Sacrament in the Church of England has been accompanied by a revived devotion to social and personal righteousness. It is, then, a singularly unconvincing method of argument which labels "unethical" a practice which does not happen to appeal to us. Mr. Eeles' learned paper shows that on such lines the Eucharist itself might be declared "unethical" with quite as much reason (see p. 118). None the less the present writer shares Dr. Headlam's view that the ethical witness of our Lord's ministry of teaching is quite as important a part of Christianity as devotion to the Risen Lord. But it ought to be noticed that in the accounts of the appearances of the Risen Lord, teaching has a prominent place in leading the disciples to a recognition of His Presence. Here teaching and worship are blended in one devotional atmosphere. This is the true proportion. Christian congregations need regular instruction in the ethical and social implications of the sacramental system and life. The Sacraments are not alien from human life; for they are the means to the consecration of all human powers to the service of God's Kingdom. The Blessed Sacrament, wherein earthly elements are transmuted into the Sacrificed Humanity of God Incarnate, is a foretaste of that Kingdom in its fulfilment when all human life and its earthly conditions will in like manner be transformed.

L. S. THORNTON, C.R.

MISCELLANEA

NOTES AND COMMENTS

AMONG contributors to the present issue, the Rev. R. H. Sutch is Rector of Slymbridge in the diocese of Gloucester; the Rev. A. R. Browne-Wilkinson is Principal of St. Christopher's College, Blackheath; and Canon Eck recently resigned his canonry at Chester to return to his vicarage at Ardeley in Hertfordshire.

NOTES ON PERIODICALS

La Vie et les Arts Liturgiques. April–October, 1926.

This monthly review, which has now completed its twelfth year of existence, and which, we regret to learn, is compelled on financial grounds to suspend publication for a while, has been rendering valuable service in promoting the revival of the arts as applied to the worship of the Church, and a sound tradition of liturgical observance based on the historical study of rites and ceremonies. It is under the supervision of Dom Cabrol, and among the members of its committee is Mgr. Batifol, whose address, as president of "La Société des Amis de l'Art Liturgique," is printed in the June number, and is an encouraging survey of the progress of the movement which this review represents. Two other articles deal with the progress of the liturgical movement in Holland, and contain much information on the history of the Roman Church in that country since the re-establishment of the hierarchy. M. Munier continues his series of articles on the construction and decoration of a church, and applies the principles of decoration to mosaic, glass, statuary, and bas-relief, while M. Brochet has much excellent counsel to give with regard to the electric lighting of churches. He utters a well-timed protest against the use of electric bulbs and painted metal holders in place of altar candles, and discusses the principles which should govern the lighting of the sanctuary and nave of churches. Two other articles, partly descriptive and partly historical, deal with the glass in the basilicas of Assisi and with the school of sculpture at Troyes in the sixteenth century. The revival of the use of the full Gothic chasubles, in place of the debased chasubles "boîte à violon" is discussed in more than one article, and their legitimacy, in view of the fears excited by some recent pronouncements of the Congregation of Rites, is defended by Père Pierret, who maintains that their use is implied by more than one rubric, as well as by the form with which the newly ordained priest is invested with the chasuble. It is just because the chasuble covers the whole body that it is spoken of mystically as "vestem sacerdotalem," *per quam caritas intelligitur*, and only so can it denote the complete, wide-reaching, universal character of love.

Of more distinctly liturgical interest are two articles by Dom Gougaud on the history of the marriage rite, and the valuable article, more technical in character, by Dom de Puniet on the Roman sanctoral and the Sundays after Pentecost, in which he discusses the history of the Roman rite in Gaul, and the fusion of "Gelasian" and "Gregorian" usages in the matter of the sanctoral and the dominical calendar. In the attempt to

stabilize the Sundays after Pentecost, by grouping them into three sections, and numbering them according to their incidence after the three feasts of St. Peter and St. Paul, St. Laurence, and St. Michael, a usage attested by the ninth-century MS. of Padua, Dom de Puniet sees a genuine Roman feature. The place of Charlemagne in the calendar, and the history of the observance of his feast, is the subject of another historical article. Of a more popular character are the expositions of some of the prayers of the Roman Missal and the description of the rite of ordination of a priest. Under the heading *Gregoriana* there are reviews of recent literature on the Gregorian chant. We cannot conclude without expressing our good wishes for "une vitalité nouvelle quand sonnera l'heure de la reprise" of which the editors speak in their final notice to their readers.

J. H. SRAWLEY.

Irénikon.

This attractive periodical is published by the Monks of the Union of the Churches from April to December. In January, February, and March a series of ten studies in pamphlet form will appear. The first six issues of the Review have been sold out and will be reprinted.

The subscription for the Review (alone) is 3s. 6d. including postage, 7s. including the collection of studies. Write "A la Direction de Irénikon, Prieuré d'Amay-sur-Meuse, Belgium."

In March, 1924, the present Pope expressed his desire that certain monks should be set apart to devote themselves to the work of Reunion and the study of the languages, psychology, liturgies, and theology of their separated brethren. Under the leadership of Dom Lambert Beaudoin, O.S.B., about a dozen monks of different nationalities have been selected for this task, and in the first number of *Irénikon* they have outlined their policy. They hold, and we shall all agree with them, that there must be a spiritual reconciliation of minds and hearts before there can be any question of formal and legal reunion. By prayer, study, charity, and missionary activity they desire to be "professionals" of unity, and claim the assistance of the faithful laity.

Their primary concern is with the Orthodox Churches of the East. They have a Byzantine Chapel in which the Eastern Liturgy is daily celebrated, we presume after the form used in Westminster Cathedral on October 30, at the conclusion of a Conference in which some of the monks took part.

They say plainly that there need be no Latinizing of the East, no proselytizing, e.g., of Russian exiles. The Imperialist conception of unity so abhorred by our separated brethren ought never to be that of true apostles of the union.

The July number has a sympathetic article on the "Rapprochement anglo-oriental," which concludes with a statement that when once the Anglo-Orthodox Union is consummated it will become evident that one question only separates us—what place did the Christ assign in His Church to Peter and his successors? But in the article following, on "The Anglican Question," they take a less hopeful line in asserting that the true Catholic Church in England is that at the head of which is found Cardinal Bourne, and accepting the decision of Leo XIII. against Anglican Orders. After all, this is the actual position from which we must start, and the article returns to the Anglo-Orthodox *rapprochement* and the hopes which may be built upon it. Very generous words are used about the Historical,

Biblical, and Patristic erudition which Anglican scholarship offers and the love of, and familiarity with, Holy Scripture, "the innate distinction of most Anglicans." They fully understand our internal dissensions and refuse to judge us by the private acts of a priest or a bishop ! Only official documents and the authentic decisions of qualified assemblies must be taken into account.

We shall look with interest to the future work of the Monks of Unity, and in conclusion must note that at the end of each number they print an artistic photograph of some famous ikon or fresco.

Ephemerides Theologicae Lovanienses. October, 1926. .

There is an interesting article by L. Delporte on "A Text of St. Luke on our Solidarity with Christ" (Luke xxii. 15-37). G. Kiselstein writes on "Accidental Causality in Moral Theology." Among the notes is one by Al. Janssens on Anglican opposition to Anglo-Catholic claims. Not unnaturally he regards the "Call to Action" signed by 130 leading Churchmen as an important manifesto and prints it in full with notes and comments, quoting Canon Ollard's description of the opinions of the Evangelical party and the *Church Times* collection of examples of the teaching given by signatories to this manifesto who are of "the liberal (Modernist or Broad Church) party" !

He also quotes as a definition of Anglo-Catholicism the reply to Canon Storr's questions in the *Church Times* of October 30, 1925, p. 492, and claims that Anglo-Catholics are Protestants like the rest. His conclusion is that Anglo-Catholics are a minority in the Church of England and a tiny minority in the Anglican Communion taken as a whole. I do not think that he understands the situation, but it is well that readers of THEOLOGY should be informed about his opinion, and we may hope that he will presently read *Essays Catholic and Critical* which would do more to revise it than a direct reply to the article. We may note further an excellent article on "The Music of the Church and the People," by H. Van de Wattyne, an excellent series of short reviews, and the usual bibliography.

The November number of the *Nouvelle Revue Théologique* has a very sound article on "The Life of Grace," by Emile Delaye, S.J. He defines it as the communication made to man of the Divine Persons. "The fundamental explanation of our deification is in the mysterious union which God contracts with the soul in justifying it: as the presence of the sun makes necessary the luminous atmosphere, so it is the presence of God in the soul that will make it divine" (St. Thomas, IIIa, Q. 7, A. 13). With brief extracts from the Fathers he illustrates the teaching of the New Testament on "the Gift of the Holy Spirit," "the mystery of the Christ," "our sonship by adoption," "the divine and eternal life." This is followed by another excellent article on "St. Paul as a Writer," by Jean-Marie Aubry, S.J. He shows how much new light has been thrown on his Greek vocabulary by recent researches, but adds a note of warning. This spoken language must not be confounded with popular language. St. Paul is not vulgar. He has consorted with cultured people. He possesses with exact shades of meaning abstract words, fit to express the

truths of a religious philosophy. One could wish to make many quotations. One must suffice: "Like a statue of Michael Angelo the prose of Paul guards his soul."

There is an interesting note on "A Monumental Commentary on the Acts of the Apostles" by Professor M. E. Jacquier of Lyons. Among Acts of the Holy See may be noted a Letter to Vicars and Apostolic Prefects of China urging "the institution of an indigenous clergy," which is important in view of the recent arrival in Rome of six Chinese priests to be consecrated by the Pope himself.

— A. E. BURN.

The International Review of Missions. October, 1926.

The comparative study of religions forces more and more to the front the problem of the relation of Christianity to the rest, and its uniqueness and superiority. Professor H. Frick (Giessen), suggests methods of comparison and finds the superiority of Christianity to lie in the Person of its Founder, who is both Founder and Saviour and Revealer and the Revelation all in one; it faces all realities and brings nevertheless a message of hope and courage; it is exclusive and does not allow borrowing or accommodation; it is embodied in a Church; a sense of its superiority and uniqueness is essential if the Church is to fulfil her missionary task. Miss E. D. Earthy offers some interesting thoughts on the utilization by the Church of existing religious ideas and practices in the mission field, based upon her knowledge of the Gazaland women (Portuguese E. Africa). The Rev. S. J. Covey, LL.D. (U.S.A.) thinks that the missionary appeal to-day, while including all the traditional and essentially central elements, should be concentrated upon the student world, should frankly recognize the changed world conditions, should openly confess the inconsistency between the nominal profession of "Christian" nations and their practice, should work on the intensive rather than the extensive method, and should aim at co-operation and reunion between denominations. Professor J. T. Addison (U.S.A.) and Miss A. M. Henty deal with the noteworthy increase of social service activities in Japan, especially in Buddhist circles; this is a remarkable phenomenon because it is at odds with the fundamental principles of Buddhism. Dr. J. H. Oldham discusses the failure of Western education in India, basing his thoughts on Mr. A. Mayhew's book, *The Education of India*. The system has failed because it has ignored the home, has taken no account of religion, and has been too closely identified with the State.

H. S. MARSHALL.

The Journal of Religion. Vol. VI., No. 5. (University of Chicago Press.)

When the question is propounded, "Are the cosmic God and the God of inner religious experience two different Gods, or are they the same?" it does not come altogether as a surprise to read on a subsequent page that "God is that dependable Factor which always responds ultimately to the right religious adjustment." But not even the capital "F" can put us at our ease. Nor is the assertion that this "Factor" is "the God of experimental religion" any more reassuring. What, then, are we to make of "psycho-physical organs within the one great cosmic psycho-physical organism"?

For the patient reader there is worse to follow, for, in the next article of this Journal, he will probably be stunned when he reads that "a religious experience may be registered in the personality as a physiological mechanics of response to a well-known life-situation." What, too, is to be made of a religious experience "motivated in the individual"? Or of experience as "in the socio-cosmic-moral sense utilitarian"? And what of the statement that "Immediacy of life-values is imperative"?

Out of the welter of similar phrases appears occasionally a lucid statement; but then we are constrained to dissent. It is not, in our opinion, true that "Revelation as a dogma is dissolved by critical historical research"; nor that "Eugenics is the handmaid of religion." If we understood what is meant by "The foundations of apologetics are shaken under the impact of deliberative experimentalism," we think that we should deny that also! We must, in short, be classed among those "exponents of 'set apart' religion" who maintain that the writer of the article "holds a fallacious position"; but not as of those who "claim that this article projects a philosophical theory about the primacy of psychology in religion to repudiate the historic prestige of religious metaphysics," because we should, certainly, express ourselves in quite other terms.

S. P. T. PRIDEAUX.

Revista Eclesiástica. October, 1926. (Editorial Voluntad, S. A. Alcalá, 28, Madrid.)

This month the Cathedral of Toledo celebrated its seventh centenary, and there are articles on the history of the Cathedral and its treasures, and on the ancient Toledan Liturgy, a variant of the Roman Rite which preserves many features of local use. This Rite supplanted the earlier Mozarabic or Visigothic Rite, which now survives, in a somewhat corrupted form, only in one Chapel of the Cathedral of Toledo. The writer deplores the "itch for Romanizing" that led to the interpolation in the Mozarabic Liturgy of borrowings from the Toledan *Missale Mixtum*, although that varies considerably from the present Roman use. It is especially interesting to note that it allows the priest to prepare the elements either before the *Officium* (Introit), or before the Gospel, or before the Offertory; that he turns to the people with eyes closed to say *Obsecro vos, fratres, orate pro me*; and that he prefacing the Canon with *Aperi, Domine, os meum* (as said before the Office in the Roman Breviary)—corresponding to the English Prayer of Humble Access. The ceremonies of Palm Sunday and Holy Week are especially interesting—as is also the colour sequence. Red was used for Epiphany, green for St. John the Baptist, gold for Saints not martyrs or Apostles, blue for Trinity and the Sundays after Pentecost, grey and brown for Lent, black for Passiontide—although for Palm Sunday the altar is white and the cope green—and all colours for All Saints'.

There is also an article about the Russian Church and its relations with Rome, based upon the views of Baron Wrangel, an eminent Orthodox Russian. It is refreshing to note the frankness with which the tactlessness of Vatican methods is admitted.

W. S. PORTER.

REVIEWS

THOMAS BECKET, ARCHBISHOP OF CANTERBURY. By W. H. Hutton, D.D., Dean of Winchester. Cambridge University Press. 8s. 6d.

This is a greatly revised edition of a book published (1910) by Messrs. Pitman and long out of print. Since its first appearance there has been much discussion upon some parts of the history of Becket, especially upon Maitland's Essay on the actual proposals made by Henry II. in the Constitutions of Clarendon (reprinted in his *Canon Law in the Church of England*, Methuen, 1898), and Canon A. J. Mason's (*What became of the Bones of St. Thomas?* Cambridge, 1920) discussion of the relics. These matters needed, and receive here, more consideration. Needless to say that, in any book by Dr. Hutton, the general history, the many artistic memorials, and, above all, the French background of Becket's exile, receive sympathetic attention: Appendix II. (*Some Memorials of St. Thomas*), mentioning, as I am glad to see, the beautiful wall-paintings in Pickering Church, is particularly useful. It is perhaps well to re-echo the author's plea against the late "barbarism" "À Becket" for the simple and correct "Becket."

Maitland's case is stated and discussed. The King had much precedent on his side, although precedent may not be inviolable: he stood for custom, and had possibly something of Canon Law in his favour. The appearance of a defendant in the civil court rightly recognized the supremacy of law, and Henry would have allowed a trial in the ecclesiastical court; Becket contended that to hand the criminal clerk over to the secular courts for further punishment after degradation meant a double punishment for one offence. This was a natural argument: degradation, which in Church custom could be accompanied with a penitential imprisonment, was a severer punishment then than it would be now. Furthermore, clerical immunity was probably needed in those days if the Church was to keep its position as the guardian of morality and religious liberty in face of an often arbitrary lay power. This immunity was doubtless often stretched too far, and when conditions were more settled it became an anachronism bad for both Church and State, and finally impossible and absurd. We see here a clash of principles, one perhaps unavoidable for the time, but rightly doomed to pass away; the other right in itself and destined to triumph, but easily abused by a violent, if a great, ruler such as Henry was.

As to the problem whether the bones found in 1888 were really those of Becket, Dr. Hutton, while admiring the fulness of Dr. A. J. Mason's study, rejects his conclusion that they were. Here he seems to have the facts and the earlier evidence (such as Harpsfield's) on his side. Henry VIII. had a special grudge against St. Thomas, and it is only too likely that his poor bones were burnt.

Even without the overwhelming popular worship of the Archbishop, the conflict between him and the King needs discussion as a crisis in the relations between the English State and the Church. The English Church under Lanfranc had stood somewhat apart from the general Hildebrandine movement; then the saintly Anselm had brought the new ideal of Western Church organization into English politics; a conflict between it and the power given to the King in English ecclesiastical life was inevitable when the national system was being made coherent. When the conflict did come, it was made more intense and dramatic by the strong personality of Becket trying to enforce the clerical ideal of his day, and by the statesmanlike strength of Henry II. with his coherent scheme of government, marred by the demoniac violence of his inherited Angevin nature.

It is difficult to strike the balance between looking at it as a drama where the characters and actions of the heroes count for everything, and as a great clash of principles between the Church with its assertion of clerical immunities and the State with its needed enforcement of uniform order over all men. Modern men and modern days understand better the need for the latter, essential for all time and for the nation's growth. But perhaps few who know the eleventh century with all its abuses of secularization and its difficulty in asserting spiritual religion could deny that clerical immunity, impossible as a permanence, was a necessary if temporary stage in the evolution of society.

Becket stood for the clerical programme of the day, which, since the great Papacy of Leo IX., had been adopted by Rome. An Archbishop, who realized the responsibility of his office both for the English Church and the Western world, would feel himself bound to carry it out. Hence when Becket, the King's friend and the Court official, became Archbishop, he turned at once to try and understand his new duties and the ideal which lay beneath them. This was his "conversion," but it was a conversion rather to the correct clerical ideal of his day than a deep spiritual change. Hence there seemed even then, and we feel it so even more to-day, something artificial about his new course and conduct. The power of an ideal is often shown when men, new to its training, follow it. The counter-Reforma-

tion gives us many instances. It was so with Becket. He was quite sincere and quite whole-hearted; he was no mere clerical politician as were some of his episcopal opponents; his unblemished purity of life, in a day and in a court of licence, shows the deep foundation of his personal religion. But his after-life was not, as it would have been with St. Anselm, an instinctive expression of deep-rooted saintliness; it was the attempt to carry out what he felt, and understood to be, the right policy for a servant of Christ in his high position. So his struggle shows us a strong and experienced man, as it were, slowly feeling his way to an understanding of his task; hence came at times some weakness and hesitation; at first he is ready to accept the Constitutions, but he works his way to a conviction that he ought not to do so. Once he saw his way clearly there is no more hesitation; there is even too much strength of deed and word; we have to see in him no St. Anselm, but a vigorous fighter for what he accepted as a right ideal. His new way of life, his prayers and his austerities, prove his sincerity. A possible martyrdom came to shape itself before him, and the crown, when it fell upon him, shed a pathos and a glory both upon the temporary ideal and upon the eternal right against arbitrary power for which he stood. Possibly the temporary benefited more. On the other side, Henry's insincerity and wrath tended to hide the permanent principles of sound order for which he strove. The Papacy, swayed by politics, weak, selfish, and temporizing, failed to play its part. Morally Becket stands head and shoulders above the Roman officials he came across. It was a tangled world of much selfishness, evil, and corruption in politics and in men. Becket was not, perhaps, so great a man as Henry II.; the ideal for which he even died was more one of a temporary stage than of enduring principle; what he did was dictated more by an external standard of what ought to be done than by the trained impulse of the heart. But his firmness in following what seemed right was noble in itself, and became more so by his death. This was his glory. And if his ideal was permanently impossible, that was the fault of his day rather than of himself, and for his day it was probably not only possible but even necessary. This is how we can read the life and drama carefully and sympathetically told by Dr. Hutton, although it may not be wholly his view.

The English Church is not too rich in biographies of its saints and leaders; happily many writers are turning their minds and pens in this direction. Lanfranc, Cranmer, Stephen Gardiner have had their lives retold of late. But few of the writers can show the local and general knowledge, the literary skill and the polished taste, of Dr. Hutton.

J. P. WHITNEY.

HISTORY OF MEDIÆVAL PHILOSOPHY. Maurice de Wulf. Translated by E. C. Messenger (new edition in two vols.). Vol. I., From the Beginnings to Albert the Great. Longmans, Green and Co. 15s.

It was obviously desirable that English readers should be made acquainted with the post-war edition of Dr. de Wulf's classical *History*—the fifth French edition, published in 1924. Messrs. Longmans are therefore to be congratulated on superseding their former edition, a translation of the second French edition (1905) which they published in 1909, by the present book. In externals the two editions are very dissimilar. Dr. Messenger succeeds Dr. Coffey as translator; the new edition is to be in two volumes, of which the first alone has reached us so far, each occupying as much shelf-room as the whole work did before; the typography and paper are new, but in no way inferior to those of the former edition—though one reader at least may perhaps be allowed to express regret at the disappearance of the extraordinarily pleasant and readable print of the Aberdeen Press. An addition to the new issue is its admirably detailed table of contents, which contrasts most favourably with the over-compressed table in the older edition. Thus the introductory chapter on mediæval philosophy, though substantially unaltered, is now tabulated under no less than twenty-three headings, whereas previously it had to be content with three alone. This is a concession to the needs of students on which those responsible cannot be too cordially congratulated, and it enhances the already high value of the book as a work of reference.

At first sight, again, such an easing of the enquirer's path seems all the more necessary, as the contents of the book appear to have undergone considerable rearrangement. A reader familiar with the old edition will look in vain (for example) in their accustomed places for the summaries of St. Augustine or Pseudo-Dionysius, and for other important passages. It is not easy, therefore, to use the new edition with the old or to discover how far, if at all, Dr. de Wulf has added to his material or altered his views. As a matter of fact, however, there is much less change in the new edition than might seem to be the case. Some footnotes have gone into the text; some sentences of the text have been relegated to footnotes. The hundred introductory pages on Greek and Patristic Philosophy, again, have disappeared almost entirely; but the loss is not a very great one, as the treatment was by the nature of the case extraordinarily compressed; and there are plenty of books of reference on the subject easily available. In compensation for this large excision—amounting to one-third

of the original ground here covered again—there are numerous small expansions of matter, usually in the form of references to contemporary art, literature, and politics, which certainly lighten the somewhat encyclopædic solidity of the book, without perhaps attaining to an independent value of their own. One great change, however, deserves special mention, and indeed is the most important feature of the new edition—the bibliographies have been completely revised, expanded, and brought up to date. For this feature alone the serious student of mediæval philosophy will in future be bound to have continual recourse to it, and will find himself rewarded by references not merely to the general surveys of the subject published since 1909, but also to the steady stream of invaluable monographs which has poured from continental presses, and is normally so apt to escape the notice of English readers.

One other change of importance brings us to the more general question of Dr. de Wulf's outlook as a whole. The exposition of the "scholastic synthesis," which in the former edition was combined with the account of the philosophy of Aquinas, is here disengaged from its context and presented to the reader as a substantive whole, introductory to the section on the thirteenth century. There is no doubt that Dr. de Wulf was well advised in making this change. It is true that we must wait for Volume II. for his account of Thomism; in the meantime we have in this volume his answer to the first enquiry of the student—"What is scholasticism?"—given clearly and at length, unembarrassed by the necessity of reference to a particular system which—however great in itself—is no more than one variation of an even greater whole. Dr. de Wulf's answer to this question (which is, if anything, even more emphatic in this edition than in the former) is reached in two stages. In the first (pp. 1-30) he reaches his definition of scholasticism as a system which, though not co-terminous with the whole range of philosophy even in the Middle Ages and in Catholic Europe, is nevertheless a recognizable unity by virtue of certain distinctive doctrines. In the second (pp. 269-323) he gives a review of the doctrines in question.

On the first of these points, it may be said, Dr. de Wulf has secured a certain measure of agreement. That scholasticism should ever again be identified with mere pedantry; that its relative independence, as a philosophy, from contemporary theology should be ignored; that it should be supposed to confine itself wholly to one or two problems, such as the problem of universals or that of the reconciliation of reason with faith—these, it may be supposed, are puerilities which will not return. Again, it seems true to say that the philosophies of Eriugena

in the ninth century, or of Siger of Brabant in the thirteenth, are so remote from anything that can be considered as normal in the period as to make it wiser to group them, with de Wulf, as non-scholastic or anti-scholastic. It is when we come to the author's second contention that doubts begin to gather. Can the genuine scholastics be credited with anything that can be called a homogeneous system? Did they not rather pick and choose, each one of them, from the vast constructions of their forebears, such elements as suited their purposes; each weaving his material with greater or lesser skill into a "system" of his own which often varied on all fundamental points from the systems of his contemporaries? Are not the differences between St. Thomas, Scotus, and Occam so far-reaching that it is idle to attempt to bring them under a single category? Would it not be better to say of scholasticism as a whole what M. Duhem (whom we are pleased to find Professor de Wulf mentioning with approval) says of Thomism itself: "It is not a system, but an aspiration; not a synthesis, but a desire to synthetize"?

Differences on questions so profound even as that of the hylomorphic composition of existent beings, or the unity of substantial form, may be treated as secondary, though they are significant enough. But what is to be said of the primary problem of all—the real distinction between essence and existence? Professor Taylor has taught us that the distinguishing mark of scholasticism proper is the doctrine of potency and act, and so far the schoolmen are at one. But how is it that some of them (as, for example, St. Thomas himself) identify this couplet with that of essence and existence, and so deny existence to the potential; whilst others regard the latter couplet as implying a distinction purely logical but wholly unreal? Here surely is a difference of outlook which Professor de Wulf glosses over somewhat when he casually tells us (p. 280) that opinions differed on the point. M. Duhem, on the other hand, regards the difference as one of crucial importance; and M. Rougier, in his most recent book, has emphasized the point even more. We do not hold a brief for Rougier's brilliant but perverse *Scholastique et Thomisme*, but at least it brings out two primary questions about scholasticism, both of which turn on the point we have been considering. The first is, What was it which made Aristotle so congenial to the schoolmen of the mediæval Church? The second is, How far did they modify Aristotle; and how far, in the process, introduce inconsistencies fatal to their own purposes? We cannot doubt that the rediscovery of Aristotle was the immediate impulse for the rise of scholasticism, and that the

doctrines of potency and act and of analogicity of being were its central features. But which of the two contesting views about essence and existence is the one which really coheres with them, and what are the consequences for philosophy as a whole of adopting one or the other? These are points on which M. de Wulf might quite legitimately claim, as a historian, to reserve his judgment; but they lie at the threshold of scholasticism, and we could wish that he would find it possible to deal with them. In the meantime, no one who attempts to answer them can dispense with his book, and for that we have every reason to be grateful.

It remains only to mention that this new edition is not by any means innocent of lapses in proof-reading, and needs careful revision before a new impression is issued.

K. E. KIRK.

NOTICES

TREBIZOND, THE LAST GREEK EMPIRE. By William Miller, M.A. (Oxon.,) LL.D. (Athens). S.P.C.K. 6s.

This book is the most important work on the subject that has ever been written in the English language. A century ago Fallmerayer in *Geschichte des Kaiserthums von Trapezunt* rescued the Empire from oblivion. Finlay added to our knowledge, but when he wrote *A History of Greece* in 1877 many documents, which Dr. Miller has now drawn upon, had not been published. So the "time had come," in the words of Professor Krumbacher, "for a new history of the Empire of Trebizond." Dr. Miller has taken up the challenge, and has produced an admirable work. Although the book is a short one, the amount of labour spent on his task by the author is monumental, and we have a textbook which will not easily be surpassed. It is the work of one who has the true historical instinct, and he has explored documents, many of them in manuscript, hitherto unknown.

The Empire of Trebizond is one of the curiosities of history and is but little known. It arose at the time of the Latin conquest of Constantinople in 1204; it became the seat of an empire which endured till 1461, when it was conquered by the Turks under Mahomet I. Hellenism was driven to find other centres after the Latin conquest of Constantinople. Three Greek Empires arose at Nicæa, Trebizond, and Salonika. It is remarkable that the second of these survived the capture of Byzantium by eight years.

Trebizond has had a long history. According to Eusebius it was founded in the eighth century, three years earlier than Rome. Xenophon tells us, in the *Anabasis*, that it was a colony of Sinope; other writers speak with pride of its Attic origin. Trebizond enjoyed freedom throughout the classical period of Greek history, paying tribute to the metropolis Sinope. Hadrian added greatly to its prosperity by endowing it with

an artificial harbour, so that it became the gateway through which Roman products were carried into Asia.

The Empire was founded by Alexios Comnenos, grandson of the adventurer Andronikos I., who occupied the imperial throne of Byzantium. He had friends and supporters along the Black Sea, so that when he entered Trebizond with his army in 1204 many rallied to his side, and he established his Kingdom, calling himself Grand-Comnenos and Emperor. His throne was never as secure; there was opposition from outside enemies, and especially from the powerful Seljuks. But Trebizond was considered impregnable, for nature had given it a unique position on a massive rock.

After a reign of fifteen years, the founder died at the age of forty; he was succeeded not by his son, but by his son-in-law, Andronikos I. It is interesting to note the first connection between England and Trebizond. In 1292 Edward I. sent an embassy to Tabriz, which passed through Trebizond. We are told that on this occasion the travellers suffered greatly from bad roads and stony tracks, and in consequence spent much on shoe-leather. Until 1914 this was still the usual caravan route to North-West Persia, all goods from England entering through Trebizond.

Of the twenty-one Emperors who ruled over Trebizond, Alexios III. had the longest reign, holding his throne for forty years; he was the eighteenth in a line of twenty-one sovereigns. In another seventy years the end came. We can trace three periods in her political history: first, the time of peaceful and undisturbed succession, when the Imperial family was at peace, and the neighbouring nations were either their vassals or their allies; next, the period of civil wars and domestic strife which gave foreign nations an opportunity of overrunning their territory; lastly, the danger which came with the fall of Constantinople when the Bosphorus was open and the Turk was a menace by land and sea. The Empire had done its work by saving Hellenism on the Euxine for two and a half centuries. Civil tumults, the curse of Greek communities, ancient and modern, undermined its strength, and a divided kingdom was bound to fall.

Throughout her history Trebizond was a Christian kingdom. Tradition ascribes to St. Andrew, the apostle, the preaching of the Gospel there; his name is preserved in the Metropolitan Church still standing. During the Diocletian persecution Trebizond gave a little band of martyrs to the cause of Christ—Eugenios, Canidius, Valerian, and Aquila. Eugenios became the patron-saint of the city, and to him is ascribed the courage of destroying the shrine of Mithras which stood on the hill overlooking the city. Among those present at the Council of Nicaea was the Bishop of Trebizond; the Bishop in the eighth century became a Metropolitan; in the reign of Justinian one of his successors became Patriarch of Constantinople. So in every way Trebizond is a subject full of interest to the student, and we are grateful to Dr. Miller for introducing us to an Empire and Church too long neglected by English writers. There is a very complete Bibliography in Greek and modern languages.

F. N. HEAZELL.

From Messrs. Burns Oates and Washbourne we have seven small volumes, four of which are the first instalment of the collected SPIRITUAL WORKS OF ABBOT BLOSIUS. 3s. 6d. net each.

At various times and in various forms these four volumes have already appeared in English, but the reprints will be welcome, and will, we hope, meet with "sufficient appreciation to justify the publishers in completing the undertaking." The general Editor is Dom Roger Hudlestone, of Downside, and his Introduction to Vol. III. should not be missed by any book-lover.

Vol. I. contains the "Institutio Spiritualis," and Vol. II. the "Consolatio Pusillanimum"—both translated with excellent Prefaces by Fr. Bertrand Wilberforce; Vol. III., the "Speculum Monachorum," from a seventeenth-century translation revised by the general editor; Vol. IV., the "Speculum Spirituale," in Fr. Wilberforce's translation, with a short Introduction by Fr. Delany.

Louis of Blois, who became Abbot of the eleventh-century Benedictine foundation at Liessies in Hainault when he was only twenty-four years old, was one of the best and best-known spiritual guides of the sixteenth century. Such is his spiritual insight, his practical sense, his sound learning, his abounding charity that Christians of a later day and not of his own communion may draw much help and strength for their spiritual life from his copious and pellucid pages. His familiarity with Holy Scripture might give food for thought to many a so-called "Protestant" ready to boast of an open Bible, but not so ready to read it. His breadth of mind is shown, to take one instance only, in his defence of Tauler against attack. His sense of humour, maybe unconscious, comes out in such a sentence as, "Those who are where there is holy reading during meals should attend to what is read if they can understand it." Blosius will, we hope, find many fresh readers, and their attention, we can promise, will not be likely to flag through failure to understand him.

THE MANICHEES AS SAINT AUGUSTINE SAW THEM. By Joseph Rickaby, S.J.

In the space of 56 pages Fr. Rickaby gives a succinct and useful account of this heresy (one which still has its modern followers), and of the way in which it was handled by St. Augustine (who had himself been a Manichee for nine years).

The pamphlet reads rather like a series of notes for lectures, but it may be recommended as fulfilling the promise of its title, though it may be remembered that no less an authority than a Lord Almoner's Reader in Arabic at Cambridge has stated that the amount of positive knowledge which can be gathered from Augustine on Manichæism is much less than might have been expected.

On p. 48 the Modernists will find themselves coupled with the Manichees. On the other hand, we welcome Fr. Rickaby's appreciation of the work done on St. Augustine by Dr. Sparrow Simpson and Canon Ottley.

One sentence on p. 43 seems to need some qualification. St. Augustine's dealing with the familiar O.T. "difficulty" due to the wars of extermination draws this dictum from Fr. Rickaby: "We must still remember that the O.T. office of slaughtering sinners is not yet obsolete in the New, and probably never will be while men are what they are."

THE SPIRIT OF ST. THÉRÈSE DE L'ENFANT JÉSUS. Translated at the Carmel of Kilmacud, Stillorgan. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 3s. and 4s. 6d.

This selection from the devotional writings and letters of St. Thérèse is published with high commendation, both from the Cardinal Prefect of the Sacred Congregation of Rites and from the Bishop of Bayeux.

St. Thérèse seems to have been a soul of extraordinarily simple piety, which found its expression in rapturous exclamations of love. After much suffering she passed away in September, 1897, and twenty-four years later was canonized in the papacy of Benedict XV. People are edified in such different ways that criticism of such outpourings as are contained in this book would hardly be fitting. Suffice it to say that probably such a book will make no very strong appeal to the more matter-of-fact English Churchfolk; and let two quotations serve as a sample of the saint's style:

"Yes, I will sing, I will always sing, even if my roses must be gathered in the very midst of thorns, and the longer and sharper the thorns, the sweeter shall be my song." After calling Jesus "the Divine Thief," she breaks out: "I love Him so much that I am always pleased with what He does. I should love Him none the less even if He did not come to steal me; on the contrary, when He disappoints me I pay Him all manner of compliments: He no longer knows how to act with me." Some saints are certainly at ease in Zion.

A PASSPORT TO PARNASSUS: AN ANTHOLOGY OF CATHOLIC POETS. Compiled by Shane Leslie. Burns Oates and Washbourne. 7s. 6d.

Mr. Shane Leslie is fully aware that he is using the term "Catholic" "within certain limits." He writes: "This collection wanders through a thousand years of English letters, but it returns to the meridian of Rome. The English authors selected all died in communion with the Holy See." An anthologist must no doubt be arbitrary, but it seems a needlessly hard saying when Mr. Leslie adds, "Vague and vagabond Anthologies are an oppression to the modern shelf." Such is gratitude, O shade of Palgrave and substance of "Q"!

It is easy to picture Mr. Leslie at the foot of Parnassus in the garb of Censor Deputatus. The poets advance. "Passport in order? Oh yes, I see the meridian of Rome. Welcome, my dear aspirant. Nihil obstat, except, of course, the trifling steepness of the slope" (and, indeed, some of the admitted stumble woefully).

"It is a long lane which does not lead to Rome," says our anthologist in the entertaining piece of special pleading with which he introduces his book. It is—and down it walk arm-in-arm Herrick and Herbert, Shelley and Keats, Tennyson and Browning, to name only a few excluded from the heights for lack of so-called Catholicity.

However, it is idle to quarrel with an anthologist's choice. Let us be grateful for what we have within the prescribed limits. Here in a charmingly produced pocket volume we have specimens of the work of some fourscore writers from Cædmon to Aubrey Beardsley, whose names we know, and some three more dozen or so anonymous poems. Plenty indeed, and for the most part flowers worth gathering.

Here are six martyrs (properly rubricated) of the sixteenth century, and they include Thomas More and Robert Southwell; Mr. Plunkett and

Mr. Macdonagh, executed for treason in 1916, are represented by a poem each; the Great War has only two fallen heroes who made verse—Tom Kettle and Francis Ledwidge—and five "Holy Women" share a dozen pages, out of which Alice Meynell shines supreme.

The greater part of the poems are familiar, and what fresh discoveries there are are not of the most distinguished beauty. But no lover of good literature will reckon it an "oppression" to add this slender book to his "modern shelf," and we have no doubt that many readers besides the accepted "faithful" will make a second edition necessary.

In view of that likelihood it would be well for the compiler to transpose the footnote words on p. 233 f., and to restore the proper reading "their dust" in Shirley's oft misquoted Dirge (p. 204).

If Shakespeare must be dragged into the "Catholic" circle, let him be quoted accurately (p. 4). Lastly, and strangest of all, there are no less than three mistakes in what is probably the most familiar poem in the book—Newman's "The Pillar of Cloud" (p. 265). But then, "Lead, Kindly Light" was written when Newman was an Anglican, poor man with an incomplete passport.

A. E. SMITH.

THE CHURCH'S MINISTRY OF HEALING. By J. R. Pridie. S.P.C.K. 4s. 6d.

Mr. Pridie has the best of all intuitions for a writer, the intuition as to where a book is really needed. He does not merely add to the pile; he fills a gap. His previous book on the Spiritual Gifts brought into one volume information which may, or may not, have been scattered about in other writings, but which was certainly not available for the ordinary reader. Once again Mr. Pridie has earned our gratitude. This book on the Ministry of Healing is not just one more harmless but unnecessary book on a popular subject. It is a necessary book; the world of thought would be poorer without it. First, it is scholarly; there is no slipshod logic nor manipulative exegesis. Secondly, it is reverent, and for that we may well be thankful; for many writers on this subject appear to be so familiar with the workings of the Divine Mind that they deny to God the attribute of Incomprehensibility. Furthermore, the style has that courteous and convincing merit which Plato fathered on Socrates: when Mr. Pridie remarks, "it seems permissible to think," we may not lull ourselves into the expectation of some quaint conceit or some hoary platitude; much more likely we shall have to face the stab of some startling truth.

When a book is packed so tight with thoughts, it requires a review longer than itself to do it justice. In trying to sum it up in a few words, the adjective which springs to one's mind is "sound." It is sound in philosophy, sound in history, sound in its applications. "Laws do not presuppose facts, but facts laws," is a pregnant statement of principle, without which there can be no true freedom in the pursuit of knowledge; but it is a principle too often ignored by those who call themselves scientific enquirers. Mr. Pridie's contention that the conversion of Constantine was an historical landmark at which the dominant note of the Church degenerated from δύναμις to ἐξουσία is most suggestive. He shows its practical application when he says, "At first Unction was used as a Sacrament of power for help to live, but later it was used as a Sacrament of authority to assure the passing soul that all was well as he went forward into the unknown."

As regards the present position, a strong point is made of the fact that healing is only a part of a wider redemption—"Life or health for its own sake is not to be sought, but life or health *for the glory of God.*" Another point of vital importance, especially in face of the self-centred impatience of many who dabble in Spiritual Healing, is that healing is a corporate work; we are healed as members of the Body of Christ; "that will ultimately mean that our work is to be done under the guidance and direction of the Body, not as a single, exclusive individual effort."

A. W. HOPKINSON.

BRITISH SLAVERY AND ITS ABOLITION, 1823-1888. By William Law Mathieson. Longmans. 10s.

Students and general readers will alike rejoice in this admirable volume—an analysis and a picture of the nature of slavery under Parliamentary government, and of the process of its abolition.

The state of society depicted is one of widely varied types according to the laws of the European states which sanctioned it. Denmark was the most humane, and the pioneer of abolition. But Spain faced the problem most thoroughly, while Britain shirked it.

Continental and insular conditions, too, were different, while sugar, coffee, and cotton slavery were separately distinctive. The thing was essentially economic, but complicated by political threads. Crown colonies might be reformed by ministerial command, but many islands possessed political rights over which they were most touchy. There was the revenue to consider, English capitalists, East Indian competition; nor could any minister wish to offend the "West India interest" of over fifty borough-owners supported by the shipping and commercial interests of London, Bristol, and Liverpool. "Who will laugh at Sugar now?" might be the whisper of Chatham's ghost.

The chapters covering the Abolition movement are less lucid, and read almost like an excerpt from a fuller work, desirable explanations being too often omitted. But we discover many eminent men outside their conventional rôles: Dundas, a pioneer in humane foresight, or Canning trying to hush up this dangerous topic.

The impression conveyed is that the planters, aware of an insoluble problem, simply prayed that it might last their time, while ministers hoped to shelve a question over which they must lose votes. The only people who come well out of the contest are the devoted missionaries.

One disappointing omission it is to be hoped Dr. Mathieson will have the generosity to supply in a second edition. A full list of his wealth of authorities, with some intimation of their respective merits, is a desideratum. At present they lurk in footnotes, where (e.g.) "Macpherson, *Annals*" is hardly distinctive. The index is sadly defective; it ought to tell the reader (as the text does not) *which* earl or lord is being quoted. As with the political allusions, the author forgets that only to specialists are these familiar friends.

A. D. GREENWOOD.

ESSAYS IN POPULAR SCIENCE. By Julian Huxley, Professor of Zoology in King's College, London. Chatto and Windus.

Professor Huxley has brought together in this book a number of articles on biological subjects having the common property of being

written in a language "understood of the people." As examples of the subjects treated we may cite Heredity, Sex-determination, the biological meaning of Death, Birth Control, Evolution and Purpose, and a final long essay on modern Embryology, illustrated by the development of the frog. If anything, Professor Huxley is here a little too sober; only rarely do we find traces of the writer of "The Shaving of the Absolute"; the inspiring war-cry of "Up, Barbers, and at him!" is here exchanged for a more unexciting professorial style. Perhaps this is not inadvisable, however; it might be held that a "plain, naked, manner of speaking" best fits a book on popular science.

The appearance of such a good book as this, meant explicitly to instil a certain degree of scientific-mindedness into the man in the street, sets one inevitably thinking about a great problem only as yet in its larval stage, but destined to require an answer from us some day. To what extent shall practical life be influenced by theoretical ideas, ideas which grow ever more abstract and more partial in their significance? The medieval man in the street was nourished and sustained almost completely on mental food prepared by religion; the question is how far his successor will be similarly dependent on science. It is hard to overrate the influence of the endocrine glands on man's constitution, mental as well as bodily; Professor Huxley's frontispiece exemplifies this in a striking way. And as it were by an extrapolation of a curve whose shape we already know, we can predict that a time will come, if it has not come already, when legal responsibility, no less than the theology of sin, will be profoundly affected by our knowledge of the hormones and their effects on the mind. It was no rhapsodist who said that the treatment of crime would in the future become a department of medicine rather than law.

Yet science, just as much as religion, is an abstraction from the real, a lopped-off piece of human experience. From one point of view, determinism is requisite and necessary as an hypothesis; from another, it is necessary to suppose its absurdity. How are these methodological fictions to be dealt with in practical life? In that day we shall have to find an answer. Meanwhile, let us all read Professor Huxley's book, and by adding some scientific experience to our other sorts, grow nearer to the full stature of men. For the answer will never be got by gnomes.

JOSEPH NEEDHAM.

THE MIND AND CHARACTER OF HENRY SCOTT HOLLAND. By Edward Lyttelton. A. R. Mowbray and Co. 10s. 6d.

At first sight it is a little difficult to see why Dr. Lyttelton should have been invited to write this book. "I knew Scott Holland," he says, "fairly well, and had read several of his sermons. But when, on undertaking this little supplementary memoir, I re-read attentively many of the sermons and addresses, I found that I had a grotesquely inadequate idea of the beauty of his character and the richness of his message: especially of the vital connection of both with the most central and least disputed doctrines of Christianity." There are many who sat eagerly at the feet of the radiant, joyous master, and from time to time felt constrained gratefully to let him know that he was not the voice in the wilderness that in his occasional moments of depression he feared that he was. There is one, Dr. Richmond, a contemporary and fellow-teacher, who has

already done much to explain to the world the philosophic worth of Holland's message. Why turn to a fresh judgment? But presently to an attentive reader it becomes evident that we have here an extremely valuable commentary and interpretation. The author's own experience of life has been different from Holland's. But he brings to his great subject a cultured and intensely Christian mind, and he has analyzed the prophet's creed and teaching with singular success.

It is to be feared that Holland's work will gradually be forgotten. Owing to his health, the demands made on him for sermons, and perhaps to some causes in himself, he produced no massive single book. His essay in *Lux Mundi*, his Romanes Lecture, and his work on the Fourth Gospel, are the nearest approaches to this. But all the time he was pouring out in his Cathedral sermons, and in his beloved *Commonwealth*, the treasures of an exuberant imagination, informed by a powerful mind, and purged and chastened by a disciplined, converted soul. The result was a contribution vitally needed by the men of his generation, not less essential for to-day and to-morrow. Alive to the finger-tips, aware of all modern movements, aflame with moral indignation at the least hint of injustice, impurity, or falsehood, he found all his inspiration in Christ and His Church, and in the Catholic Creed. He was sometimes criticized because he had no fixed social programme. The Christian Social Union, of which he seemed the embodiment, was criticized because, religiously, it was so definite, and, politically, so vague. But Holland found in the Bible a never-ending source of material for his pulpit-teaching, and in the faith of the Incarnation a never-ending source of inspiration for the unconquerable hopefulness of his social outlook. He had too much respect for freedom to be a purveyor of great solutions for great problems. With his prophetic voice he cried, "Thus saith the Lord," and left it to man's conscience to take up the challenge.

Dr. Lyttelton has discerned all this most truly, and has described it with affectionate care. The book is in places a little dry, because it confines itself severely to its purpose. But for that purpose, as a study of Holland's mind and character, it is an excellent and timely book.

S. C. CARPENTER.

THE BLESSED VIRGIN. By M. R. Newbolt. S.P.C.K. 3s. 6d.

This beautiful little book, in which piety is combined with sanity, is recommended to all those who, with the author, think that "there ought to be in the Church of England some bridge between the minority who seek to promote our Lady's honour with a kind of aggressive and exasperated emphasis, and the vast majority who leave all devotion to her out of their everyday religious life." It is good for us to be reminded that there is a strong tradition of devotion to the Blessed Virgin in the post-Reformation English Church, which extends from Donne and Crashaw through Bishops Pearson and Ken to Wordsworth and Keble: though we must not forget that they use the language of devotional poetry, not of dogma. Thus Wordsworth's "Our tainted nature's solitary boast" does not mean that he believed in the Immaculate Conception. The Incarnation, with which the Mother of God is inseparably connected, is shown to be the point where Christianity triumphs over Islam and Hinduism; but perhaps it should be more clearly stated that there is no

truly Catholic "doctrine of Mary" save that she was a Virgin when her Divine Son was born, and that she is rightly called Theotokos.

The weakness of the book is an insufficient attention to the requirements of history. Thus it is not enough to say that the Immaculate Conception and the Assumption are only "pious personal opinions." For neither of these beliefs is there the slightest trace of what a critical historian calls evidence. To believe statements of fact for which there is no evidence is not piety but superstition; and we are bound to be stricter in our requirement of sufficient evidence than they were in the seventeenth century. Even in the Roman Communion the Assumption is no more than a "pious opinion"; yet Pope Benedict XIV. declared it to be "a probable opinion which to deny were impious and blasphemous," and certainly no preacher of his communion dare do so, even to-day. Already there are many Anglican parishes where public denial of the Assumption would be followed by furious protests. This is the danger of allowing popular devotion to base itself on unhistorical legends. Whether Blessed Mary did or did not ascend into the sky is a small matter: the freedom of the preacher, within the limits of the revealed and defined faith, is a very great matter.

We must not cut Blessed Mary out of her Scriptural background. Canon Newbolt beautifully describes the Infancy narrative, directly or indirectly due to her, as the portico of St. Luke's Gospel, and shows how the beloved disciple was prepared by his daily intercourse with her whom the Lord had entrusted to him to be the author of the "spiritual gospel." Beside the reticent simplicity of the New Testament, how garish and vulgar is the cult of the half-Christianized Mother-Goddess, so common in Mediterranean lands!

The following address to Blessed Mary, taken from a Greek office book in the Orthodox church near the Virgin's Well at Nazareth, breathes the true Christian attitude towards the Mother of God:

Τί σε καλέσωμεν, ὡ Κεχαριτωμένη; οὐρανον, ὅτι ἀνέτειλας τὸν Ἡλιον τῆς δικαιοσύνης· παράδεισον, ὅτι ἐβλάστησας τὸ ἄνθος τῆς ἀφθαρσίας· παρθένον, ὅτι ἔμεινας ἀφθορος· ἀγνὴν μητέρα, ὅτι ἔσχες σαῖς ἀγκάλαις Τίόν, τὸν πάντων Θεόν. Αὐτὸν ίκέτευε σωθῆναι τὰς ψυχὰς ἡμῶν.

C. BEAUFORT MOSS.

BOOK NOTES

The First Age of Christianity. By E. F. Scott, D.D. Allen and Unwin. 5s. 6d. Such books as these, summarizing in short compass the New Testament documents and their problems, as well as the *milieu*, pagan and Jewish, in which they arose, are constantly being written. Their value depends entirely on the scholar who is responsible for them. If he has the gift of terse and lucid writing and can rethink familiar facts, then they are useful. Otherwise they may be tedious. That Dr. Scott has a special gift for clear exposition of difficult subjects will be acknowledged by all who are familiar with his books. The publishers describe him on the jacket as a "Protestant Modernist." But Catholic scholars would very largely agree with his account of the facts. What they miss is the recognition that the development here described was presided over by the Holy Spirit, and therefore represented the will of

the Church's Lord. It is not too much to hope that in the end scholars of all schools will be largely agreed as to the facts of the first age of Christianity. But there is little prospect of their interpreting them with unanimity. With this caution Dr. Scott's book can be recommended.

The History and Literature of the New Testament. By H. T. Fowler, Ph.D. The Macmillan Company. 10s. 6d. This is one of a series of American textbooks specially written for the needs of religious education in the colleges. Presumably it is intended as part of the general education of those who are not studying theology. The method is first to give a brief sketch of the background and history, then to summarize the separate books in their probable chronological order. The book is skilfully written and well adapted for its purpose. But one is left wondering whether the textbook method of approach is really calculated to attain its end, which is "the religious education" of the college student.

The Decline of the Hebrew Kingdoms. (The Clarendon Bible, Old Testament, vol. 3.) By T. H. Robinson, D.D. Oxford Press. 4s. 6d. The Editors of the Clarendon Bible have agreed that something different from the conventional Commentary was needed for the Old Testament. They have therefore, with the help of the Society for Old Testament Study, drawn up a scheme by which the literature will be discussed in five volumes, with an introductory one dealing with the external history. The present book contains notes on select passages of 2 Kings, Amos, Hosea, Micah, 1 Isaiah, Zephaniah, Deuteronomy, Nahum, Habakkuk, and Jeremiah. The Revised Version, not printed, is presupposed. The latest and freshest scholarship is found in the notes. The book will be of the greatest possible value for schools. And all but specialists will find much that is new in it. Provided that it does not supplant intensive study of individual books, it will do much good. Much skill has been shown by the publishers in the selection of the illustrations, fifty in all.

Concerning the Inner Life. By Evelyn Underhill. Methuen. 2s. It was a happy thought on the part of a group of Liverpool clergy to ask Miss Underhill to lecture to them on the spiritual life of parish priests, and of the gifted lecturer to publish her addresses in this delightful pamphlet. The gist of many books on mysticism is here given in short form. Especially striking is the advice to those who are immersed in practical activities, a class which includes most of the clergy to-day, to let their private prayers be mainly of the contemplative type, in order to keep the psychic balance true.

W. K. L. C.

Postmodernism. By Dr. Bernard Bell. Mowbray. 7s. 6d. This is a collection of valuable and interesting essays by a priest of the Anglican communion who is President of a well-known university college about a hundred miles from New York. Dr. Bell's opportunities of getting to know the young men and women of the undergraduate class in present-day America have been wide and varied, and he has made good use of them. We can recommend the book to all whose duty it is to present the Catholic faith to more or less well-educated modern people. We have been particularly impressed by Dr. Bell's conviction that Liberal Protestantism is fifteen or twenty years behind the times. "The moral revolt of the younger generation" is a penetrating and important study of an impressive phenomenon of the "post-war" world.

The Key to Faith. By M. O. Gershenson. Macmillan. 6s. 6d. Mikhail Gershenson was a nineteenth-century Russian Jew. He was a philosopher and literary critic whose characteristic conviction was that the abstract thinking which is the chosen instrument of modern rationalism is the denial of the universal, individual, spiritual life of man which alone can grasp reality. Modern civilization is the enemy of man's moral personality; it has, in some fundamental way, taken the wrong turning. So Gershenson appeals to a golden age in the past, to the fourteenth century and Dante's spiritual expression of it, to Heraclitus, to the great Hebrew prophets. This book is a profound study of the eternal value of the Old Testament from the point of view of this modern anti-scientific mysticism.

Science and Ultimate Truth. By the Very Rev. W. R. Inge, Dean of St. Paul's. Longmans, Green and Co. 1s. or 2s. This is the Fison Memorial Lecture delivered at Guy's Hospital Medical School in March, 1926. It is a clear and brief statement of what is now generally recognized as the philosophy of its brilliant author. Values, equally with facts, are part of reality. In the past, idealism and naturalism have suffered from the intolerant use of abstractions. God is not merely the inner side of the cosmic process. While the path of salvation is revealed to us, the "how" of creation is unknown. Religion is homage to the Eternal, not promises and threats, too often materialistic, about the future. In short, a beautiful but static interpretation of reality.

Happiness. By Father Vernon, S.O.C. Mowbrays. 1s. 6d. The five addresses in this book, with the exception of the last, were given to fashionable congregations in the West End of London. Father Vernon has gained, and keeps, a unique reputation as a missioner. In spite of obvious gaps in his theological equipment, of a limited and rather colourless vocabulary, of more than a trace of self-consciousness, these addresses are surprisingly interesting and attractive. The preacher has real gifts as a psychologist; the monk understands the world. His redeemed earnestness and passionate sincerity sometimes fuse the commonplace words into a living phrase. It is, however, a thousand pities that Father Vernon cannot put himself to school to some master of pulpit oratory, to Newman or Robertson, to learn words adequate to his message.

Liberal Christianity. By W. P. Merrill. Macmillan. 7s. 6d. A popular exposition of Liberal Protestantism by a New York Presbyterian minister. It has special reference, naturally, to the situation in America, dominated as it is by the issue raised by Fundamentalism. It is reverent, interesting, clear but not profound, honest, and not too shockingly daring. It reveals, all unconsciously, the weaknesses of the Liberal Protestant position. Mr. Merrill does not understand sacramentalism, and he does not know why some people think that orthodoxy is a valuable conception.

A. E. B.